

A SHORT HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE

*From the Age of the Puritans in 1583
To the Outbreak of the European War, 1914
With a continuation of the historical summary
begun by R. P. Farley, including sections
dealing with Britain, 1918-1939 and 1945-
1960*

'Peace hath her victories
No less renowned than war.'

Milton's couplet from the Sonnet to Cromwell might well describe Green's monumental work, the aim of which is so aptly defined by its full title, *A Short History of the English People*. This story of our island race from the year 449 to 1960 concentrates more on the generations that have made up the realm than on a chronicle of its kings and battles. Green himself said that he had striven throughout to avoid writing a 'drum and trumpet history,' and considered that war played a small part in the real story of European nations, and in that of England its part is smaller than in any.'

Of recent years many of our historians have followed Green (Trevelyan's *Social History* is a fine example), and the study of history has become as much a study of institutions and peoples as of the leading figures. A Hitler, a Napoleon, a Nelson are only understood if set within the frame of their epoch.

Green's humanitarian history is therefore of our age, and because of its vivid, picturesque style, fit to be placed beside

[Continued on back flap]

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY: Larger Format

All new volumes and all revised and reprinted volumes in Everyman's Library are now produced in crown octavo. These are published at five prices (except in the U.S.A.) according to the length and nature of the work. Volumes at the lowest price are in red shaded wrappers, marked * in catalogues; the second price in blue shaded wrappers †; the third price in green shaded wrappers §; the fourth price in yellow

EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY

728

HISTORY

Everyman, I will go with thee, and be thy guide,
In thy most need to go by thy side

JOHN RICHARD GREEN, born in 1837 at Oxford and educated at Jesus College there. In 1860 took Holy orders and in 1866 was appointed incumbent of St Philip's, Stepney. Retired from the Church in 1869 and became librarian at Lambeth. He died in 1883.

JOHN RICHARD GREEN

A SHORT HISTORY
OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE

IN TWO VOLUMES · VOLUME TWO

INTRODUCTION AND NOTES BY
L. CECIL JANE

WITH A SURVEY OF
THE PERIOD 1815-1960



LONDON J. M. DENT & SONS LTD
NEW YORK E. P. DUTTON & CO INC

© Revisions, J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1960

All rights reserved

Made in Great Britain

at the

Aldine Press · Letchworth · Herts

for

J. M. DENT & SONS LTD

Aldine House · Bedford Street · London

First published in this edition 1915

STATE CENTRAL LIBRARY
WEST BENGAL

CALCUTTA

11.1.65

CONTENTS

CHAPTER VIII

PURITAN ENGLAND

SECT.	PAGE
1.—The Puritans, 1583—1603.	431
2.—The First of the Stuarts, 1604—1623.	444
3.—The King and the Parliament, 1623—1629.	461
4.—New England	472
5.—The Tyranny, 1629—1640	482
6.—The Long Parliament, 1640—1644	500
7.—The Civil War, July 1642—August 1646	512
8.—The Army and the Parliament, 1646—1649	523
9.—The Commonwealth, 1649—1653	535
10.—The Fall of Puritanism, 1653—1660	545

CHAPTER IX

THE REVOLUTION

1.—England and the Revolution	567
2.—The Restoration, 1660—1667	583
3.—Charles the Second, 1667—1673	595
4.—Danby, 1673—1678	606
5.—Shaftesbury, 1679—1682	616
6.—The Second Stuart Tyranny, 1682—1688	624
7.—William of Orange	634
8.—The Grand Alliance, 1689—1694	645
9.—Marlborough, 1698—1712	661
10.—Walpole, 1712—1742	677

CHAPTER X

MODERN ENGLAND

1.—William Pitt, 1742—1762	692
2.—The Independence of America, 1761—1785.	712
3.—The Second Pitt, 1783—1789	736
4.—The War with France, 1793—1815	756
Epilogue, 1815—1873	784

A POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SURVEY (1815—1914)

CHAPTER I

FROM WATERLOO TO THE REFORM BILL, 1815—1832

SECT.	PAGE
1.—Agrarian and Industrial Revolutions	792
2.—Agitation among Working Classes	796
3.—Foreign Policy and Free Trade	799
4.—The Demand for Parliamentary Reform	801

CHAPTER II

FROM THE REFORM BILL TO THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870,
1832—1870

1.—The Reformed Parliament and Reforms	804
2.—Queen Victoria, 1837—1901	808
3.—Crimean War, 1854—1856	814
4.—Indian Mutiny	815
5.—Political and Industrial Status of the Working Classes	817

CHAPTER III

FROM THE EDUCATION ACT (1870) TO THE OUTBREAK OF THE
EUROPEAN WAR, 1870—1914

1.—Land, Education, Army Reform	820
2.—The Near East	826
3.—Ireland	829
4.—Local Government and Social Legislation	832
5.—South African War	835
6.—The New Liberalism	836

CHAPTER IV

A SUMMARY OF EVENTS, 1914—1960

1.—The First World War, 1914—1918	841
2.—1918—1939	845
3.—The Second World War, 1939—1945	861
4.—1945—1960	863

INDEX	869
-----------------	-----

MAPS

THE AMERICAN COLONIES IN 1640	<i>facing p.</i> 474
THE WORLD SHOWING BRITISH POSSESSIONS IN 1814 AND 1914 <i>between pp.</i> 830 and 831	

WEST BENGAL

CALCUTTA

CHAPTER VIII

PURITAN ENGLAND

SECTION I.—THE PURITANS, 1583—1603

[*Authorities.*—The chief sources are Strype's Works and Parker's correspondence; a selection of ecclesiastical documents will be found in Prothero, "Statutes and Constitutional Documents." Other works of importance are Whittingham, "Brief Discours of Troubles at Frankfurt (1575)"; Pierce, "Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts"; the "Diaries of Wallington"; the "Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson," by his wife; and Masson, "Life of Milton." The best general Church history is that edited by Hunt and Stephens, the volume dealing with Elizabeth and James I. being by Frere. See also Hallam, "Constitutional History."]

No greater moral change ever passed over a nation than passed over England during the years which parted the middle of the reign of Elizabeth from the meeting of the Long Parliament. England became the people of a book, and that book was the Bible. It was yet the one English book which was familiar to every Englishman; it was read at churches and read at home, and everywhere its words, as they fell on ears which custom had not deadened to their force and beauty, kindled a startling enthusiasm. When Bishop Bonner set up the first six Bibles in St. Paul's "many well-disposed people used much to resort to the hearing thereof, especially when they could get any that had an audible voice to read to them. . . . One John Porter used sometimes to be occupied in that goodly exercise, to the edifying of himself as well as others. This Porter was a fresh young man and of a big stature; and great multitudes would resort thither to hear him, because he could read well and had an audible voice." The popularity of the Bible was owing to other causes besides that of religion. The whole prose literature of England, save the forgotten tracts of Wyclif, has grown up since his translation of the Scriptures by Tyndall and Coverdale. No history, no romance, no poetry, save the little-known verse of Chaucer, existed for any practical purpose in the English tongue when the Bible was ordered to be set up in churches. Sunday after Sunday, day after day, the crowds that gathered round Bonner's Bibles in the nave of St. Paul's, or the family group that hung on the words of the Geneva Bible in the devotional exercises at home, were leavened with a new literature. Legends and annals, war songs and psalm, State-rolls and biographies, the mighty voices of prophets, the parables of Evangelists, stories of mission journeys of perils by the sea and among the heathen, philosophic arguments, apocalyptic visions, all were flung broadcast over minds unoccupied

for the most part by any rival learning. The disclosure of the stores of Greek literature had wrought the revolution of the Renaissance. The disclosure of the older mass of Hebrew literature wrought the revolution of the Reformation. But the one revolution was far deeper and wider in its effects than the other. No version could transfer to another tongue the peculiar charm of language which gave their value to the authors of Greece and Rome. Classical letters, therefore, remained in the possession of the learned, that is of the few; and among these, with the exception of Colet and More, or of the pedants who revived a Pagan worship in the gardens of the Florentine Academy, their direct influence was purely intellectual. But the tongue of the Hebrew, the idiom of Hellenistic Greek, lent themselves with a curious felicity to the purposes of translation. As a mere literary monument, the English version of the Bible remains the noblest example of the English tongue. Its perpetual use made it from the instant of its appearance the standard of our language. But for the moment its literary effect was less than its social. The power of the book over the mass of Englishmen showed itself in a thousand superficial ways, and in none more conspicuously than in the influence it exerted on ordinary speech. It formed, we must repeat, the whole literature which was practically accessible to ordinary Englishmen; and when we recall the number of common phrases which we owe to great authors, the bits of Shakspeare, or Milton, or Dickens, or Thackeray, which unconsciously interweave themselves in our ordinary talk, we shall better understand the strange mosaic of Biblical words and phrases which coloured English talk two hundred years ago. The mass of picturesque allusion and illustration which we borrow from a thousand books, our fathers were forced to borrow from one; and the borrowing was the easier and the more natural that the range of the Hebrew literature fitted it for the expression of every phase of feeling. When Spenser poured forth his warmest love-notes in the "Epithalamion," he adopted the very words of the Psalmist, as he bade the gates open for the entrance of his bride. When Cromwell saw the mists break over the hills of Dunbar, he hailed the sun burst with the cry of David: "Let God arise, and let his enemies be scattered. Like as the sun riseth, so shalt thou drive them away!" Even to common minds this familiarity with grand poetic imagery in prophet and apocalypse gave a loftiness and ardour of expression, that with all its tendency to exaggeration and bombast we may prefer to the slipshod vulgarisms of the shopkeeper of to-day.

The
Puritans

But far greater than its effect on literature or social phrase was the effect of the Bible on the character of the people at large. Elizabeth might silence or tune the pulpits; but it was impossible for her to silence or tune the great preachers of justice, and mercy, and truth, who spoke from the book which she had again opened for her people. The whole moral effect which is produced now-a-days by the religious newspaper, the tract, the essay, the lecture,

1583
to
1603

he missionary report, the sermon, was then produced by the Bible alone. And its effect in this way, however dispassionately we examine it, was simply amazing. The whole temper of the nation was changed. A new conception of life and of man superseded the old. A new moral and religious impulse spread through every class. Literature reflected the general tendency of the time; and theumpy little quartos of controversy and piety, which still crowd our older libraries, drove before them the classical translations and Italian novelettes of the age of Elizabeth. "Theology rules there," said Grotius of England, only ten years after the Queen's death; and when Casaubon, the last of the great scholars of the sixteenth century, was invited to England by King James, he found both King and people indifferent to letters. "There is a great abundance of theologians in England," he says to a friend; "all point their studies in that direction." The study of the country gentleman pointed towards theology as much as that of the scholar. As soon as Colonel Hutchinson "had improved his natural understanding with the acquisition of learning, the first studies he exercised himself in were the principles of religion." The whole nation became, in fact, a Church. The great problems of life and death, whose "obstinate questionings" found no answer in the higher minds of Shakspeare's day, pressed for an answer from the men who followed him. We must not, indeed, picture the early Puritan as a gloomy fanatic. It was long before the religious movement—which affected the noble and the squire as much as the shopkeeper or the farmer—came into conflict with general culture. With the close of the Elizabethan age, indeed, the intellectual freedom which had marked it faded insensibly away: the bold philosophical speculations which Sydney had caught from Bruno, and which had brought on Marlowe and Raleigh the charge of atheism, died, like her own religious indifference, with the Queen. But the lighter and more elegant sides of the Elizabethan culture harmonized well enough with the temper of the Puritan gentleman. The figure of Colonel Hutchinson, one of the Regicides, stands out from his wife's canvas with the grace and tenderness of a portrait by Vandyck. She dwells on the personal beauty which distinguished his youth, on "his teeth even and white as the purest ivory," "his hair of brown, very thickest in his youth, softer than the finest silk, curling with loose great rings at the ends." Serious as was his temper in graver matters, the young squire was fond of hawking, and piqued himself on his skill in dancing and fence. His artistic taste showed itself in a critical love of "gravings, sculpture, and all liberal arts," as well as in the pleasure he took in his gardens, "in the improvement of his grounds, in planting groves and walks and fruit trees." If he was "diligent in his examination of the Scriptures," "he had a great love for music, and often diverted himself with a viol, on which he played masterly." A taste for music, indeed, seems to have been common in the graver homes of the time. If we pass from Owthorpe and Colonel Hutchinson to the house of a London

scrivener in Bread Street, we find Milton's father, precisian and man of business as he was, composing madrigals to Oriana, and rivalling Bird and Gibbons as a writer of sacred song. We miss, indeed, the passion of the Elizabethan time, its caprice, its largeness of feeling and sympathy, its quick pulse of delight; but, on the other hand, life gains in moral grandeur, in a sense of the dignity of manhood, in orderliness and equable force. The temper of the Puritan gentleman was just, noble, and self-controlled. The larger geniality of the age that had passed away shrank into an intense tenderness within the narrower circle of the home. "He was as kind a father," says Mrs. Hutchinson of her husband, "as dear a brother, as good a master, as faithful a friend as the world had." Passion was replaced by a manly purity. "Neither in youth nor riper years could the most fair or enticing woman ever draw him so much as into unnecessary familiarity or dalliance. Wise and virtuous women he loved, and delighted in all pure and holy and unblameable conversation with them, but so as never to excite scandal or temptation. Scurrilous discourse even among men he abhorred; and though he sometimes took pleasure in wit and mirth, yet that which was mixed with impurity he never could endure." The play and wilfulness of life, in which the Elizabethans found its chiefest charm, the Puritan regarded as unworthy of its character and end. His aim was to attain self-command, to be master of himself, of his thought and speech and acts. A certain gravity and reflectiveness gave its tone to the lightest details of his daily converse with the world about him. His temper, quick as it might naturally be, was kept under strict control. In his discourse he was ever on his guard against talkativeness or frivolity, striving to be deliberate in speech and "ranking the words beforehand." His life was orderly and methodical, sparing of diet and of self-indulgence; he rose early, "he never was at any time idle, and hated to see any one else so." The new sobriety and self-restraint marked itself even in his change of dress. The gorgeous colours and jewels of the Renaissance disappeared. Colonel Hutchinson "left off very early the wearing of anything that was costly, yet in his plainest negligent habit appeared very much a gentleman." The loss of colour and variety in costume reflected no doubt a certain loss of colour and variety in life itself; but it was a loss compensated by solid gains. Greatest among these, perhaps, was the new conception of social equality. Their common call, their common brotherhood in Christ, annihilated in the mind of the Puritans that overpowering sense of social distinctions which characterized the age of Elizabeth. The meanest peasant felt himself ennobled as a child of God. The proudest noble recognized a spiritual equality in the poorest "saint." The great social revolution of the Civil Wars and the Protectorate was already felt in the demeanour of gentlemen like Hutchinson. "He had a loving and sweet courtesy to the poorest, and would often employ many spare hours with the commonest soldiers and poorest labourers." "He never

disdained the meanest nor flattered the greatest." But it was felt even more in the new dignity and self-respect with which the consciousness of their "calling" invested the classes beneath the rank of the gentry. Take such a portrait as that which John Vallington, a turner in Eastcheap, has left us of a London housewife, his mother. "She was very loving," he says, "and obedient to her parents, loving and kind to her husband, very tender-hearted to her children, loving all that were godly, much misliking the wicked and profane. She was a pattern of sobriety unto many, very seldom was seen abroad except at church; when others recreated themselves at holidays and other times, she would take her needle-work and say 'here is my recreation.' . . . God had given her a pregnant wit and an excellent memory. She was very ripe and perfect in all stories of the Bible, likewise in all the stories of the Martyrs, and could readily turn to them; she was also perfect and well seen in the English Chronicles, and in the descents of the Kings of England. She lived in holy wedlock with her husband twenty years, wanting but four days."

1583
to
1603

The strength, however, of the Puritan cause lay as yet rather in the middle and professional class, than among the small traders or the gentry; and it is in a Puritan of this class that we find the fullest and noblest expression of the new influence which was saving the temper of the time. Milton is not only the highest, but the completest type of Puritanism. His life is absolutely contemporary with that of his cause. He was born when it began to exercise a direct power over English politics and English religion; he died when its effort to mould them into its own shape was over, and when it had again sunk into one of many influences to which we owe our English character. His earlier verse, the pamphlets of his riper years, the epics of his age, mark with a singular precision the three great stages in its history. His youth shows us how much of the gaiety, the poetic ease, the intellectual culture of the Renaissance lingered in a Puritan home. Scrivener and "precisian" as his father was, he was a skilful musician; and the boy inherited his father's skill on lute and organ. One of the finest outbursts in the scheme of education which he put forth at a later time is a passage, in which he vindicates the province of music as an agent in moral training. His home, his tutor, his school were all rigidly Puritan; but there was nothing narrow or illiberal in his early training. "My father," he says, "destined me while yet a little boy to the study of humane letters; which I seized with such eagerness that from the twelfth year of my age I scarcely ever went from my lessons to bed before midnight." But to the Greek, Latin, and Hebrew he learnt at school, the scrivener advised him to add Italian and French. Nor were English letters neglected. Spenser gave the earliest turn to his poetic genius. In spite of the war between playwright and precisian, a Puritan youth could still, in Milton's days avow his love of the stage, "if Jonson's learned sock be on, or sweetest Shakspeare, Fancy's child, warble his native

John
Milton

1608

1583 woodnotes wild," and gather from the "masques and antique
to pageantry" of the court-revel hints for his own Comus and Arcades.
1603 Nor does any shadow of the coming struggle with the Church
disturb the young scholar's reverie, as he wanders beneath "the
high embowed roof, with antique pillars, massy proof, and storied
windows richly dight, casting a dim religious light," or as he hears
"the pealing organ blow to the full-voiced choir below, in service
high and anthem clear." His enjoyment of the gaiety of life stands
in bright contrast with the gloom and sternness of the later
Puritanism. In spite of "a certain reservedness of natural dis-
position," which shrank from "festivities and jests, in which I
acknowledge my faculty to be very slight," the young singer could
still enjoy the "jest and youthful jollity" of the world around
him, of its "quips and cranks and wanton wiles;" he could join
the crew of Mirth, and look pleasantly on at the village fair,
"where the jolly rebecks sound to many a youth and many a
maid, dancing in the chequered shade." But his pleasures were
unreproved. There was nothing ascetic in his look, in his slender,
vigorous frame, his face full of a delicate yet serious beauty, the
rich brown hair which clustered over his brow; and the words we
have quoted show his sensitive enjoyment of all that was beautiful.
But from coarse or sensual self-indulgence the young Puritan
turned with disgust: "A certain reservedness of nature, an honest
haughtiness and self-esteem, kept me still above those low descents
of mind." He drank in an ideal chivalry from Spenser, but his
religion and purity disdained the outer pledge on which chivalry
built up its fabric of honour. "Every free and gentle spirit," said
Milton, "without that oath, ought to be born a knight." It was
with this temper that he passed from his London school, St. Paul's,
to Christ's College at Cambridge, and it was this temper that he
preserved throughout his University career. He left Cambridge,
as he said afterwards, "free from all reproach, and approved by all
honest men," with a purpose of self-dedication "to that same lot,
however mean or high, towards which time leads me, and the will
of Heaven."

Crom-
well and
Bunyan

Even in the still calm beauty of a life such as this, we catch the
sterner tones of the Puritan temper. The very height of its aim, the
intensity of its moral concentration, brought with them a loss of
the genial delight in all that was human which distinguished the
men of the Renascence. "If ever God instilled an intense love of
moral beauty into the mind of any man," said Milton, "he has
instilled it into mine." "Love Virtue," closed his Comus, "she
alone is free!" But the love of virtue and of moral beauty, if it
gave strength to human conduct, narrowed human sympathy and
human intelligence. Already in Milton we note "a certain reserved-
ness of temper," a contempt for "the false estimates of the vulgar,"
a proud retirement from the meaner and coarser life around him.
Great as was his love for Shakspeare, we can hardly fancy him
delighting in Falstaff. In minds of a less cultured order, this moral

1583
to
1603

ension ended in a hard unsocial sternness of life. The ordinary Puritan, like the housewife of Eastcheap whom we have noticed above, "loved all that were godly, much misliking the wicked and profane." His bond to other men was not the sense of a common manhood, but the recognition of a brotherhood among the elect. Without the pale of the saints lay a world which was hateful to them, because it was the enemy of their God. It was this utter isolation from the "ungodly" that explains the contrast which startles us between the inner tenderness of the Puritans and the ruthlessness of so many of their actions. Cromwell, whose son's oath (in his own words) went to his heart "like a dagger, indeed, did!" and who rode away sad and wearied from the triumph of Marston Moor, burst into horse-play as he signed the death-warrant of the King. A temper which had thus lost sympathy with the life of half the world around it could hardly sympathize with the whole of its own life. Humour, the faculty which above all corrects exaggeration and extravagance, died away before the new stress and strain of existence. The absolute devotion of the Puritan to a Supreme Will tended more and more to rob him of all sense of measure and proportion in common matters. Little things became great things in the glare of religious zeal; and the godly man learnt to shrink from a surplice, or a mince-pie at Christmas, as he shrank from impurity or a lie. Life became hard, rigid, colourless, as it became intense. The play, the geniality, the delight of the Elizabethan age were exchanged for a measured sobriety, seriousness, and self-restraint. But it was a self-restraint and sobriety which limited itself wholly to the outer life. In the inner soul of the Puritan, sense, reason, judgment were overborne by the terrible reality of "invisible things." Our first glimpse of Oliver Cromwell is as a young country squire and farmer in the marsh levels around Huntingdon and St. Ives, buried from time to time in a deep melancholy, and haunted by fancies of coming death. "I live in Meshac," he writes to a friend, "which they say signifies Prolonging; in Kedar, which signifies Darkness; yet the Lord forsaketh me not." The vivid sense of a Divine Purity close to such men made the life of common men seem sin. "You know what my manner of life has been," Cromwell adds. "Oh, I lived in and loved darkness, and hated light. I hated godliness." Yet this worst sin was probably nothing more than an enjoyment of the natural buoyancy of youth, and a want of the deeper earnestness which comes with riper years. In imaginative tempers, like that of Bunyan, the struggle took a more picturesque form. John Bunyan was the son of a poor tinker at Elstow in Bedfordshire, and even in childhood his fancy revelled in terrible visions of Heaven and Hell. "When I was but a child of nine or ten years old," he tells us, "these things did so distress my soul, that then in the midst of my merry sports and childish vanities, amidst my vain companions, I was often much cast down and afflicted in my mind herewith; yet could I not let go my sins." The sins he could not

1028

1583
to
1603

let go were a love of hockey and of dancing on the village green; for the only real fault which his bitter self-accusation discloses, that of a habit of swearing, was put an end to at once and for ever by a rebuke from an old woman. His passion for bell-ringing clung to him even after he had broken from it as a "vain practice;" and he would go to the steeple house and look on, till the thought that a bell might fall and crush him in his sins drove him panic-stricken from the door. A sermon against dancing and games drew him for a time from these indulgences; but the temptation again overmastered his resolve. "I shook the sermon out of my mind, and to my old custom of sports and gaming I returned with great delight. But the same day, as I was in the midst of a game of cat, and having struck it one blow from the hole, just as I was about to strike it the second time, a voice did suddenly dart from heaven into my soul, which said, 'Wilt thou leave thy sins and go to Heaven, or have thy sins and go to Hell?' At this I was put in an exceeding maze; wherefore, leaving my cat upon the ground, I looked up to heaven; and was as if I had with the eyes of my understanding seen the Lord Jesus looking down upon me, as being very hotly displeased with me, and as if He did severely threaten me with some grievous punishment for those and other ungodly practices."

The
Presby-
terians

Such was Puritanism, and it is of the highest importance to realize it thus in itself, in its greatness and its littleness, apart from the ecclesiastical system of Presbyterianism with which it is so often confounded. As we shall see in the course of our story, not one of the leading Puritans of the Long Parliament was a Presbyterian. Pym and Hampden had no sort of objection to Episcopacy, and the adoption of the Presbyterian system was only forced on the Puritan patriots in their later struggle by political considerations. But the growth of the movement, which thus influenced our history for a time, forms one of the most curious episodes in Elizabeth's reign. Her Church policy rested on the Acts of Supremacy and of Uniformity; the first of which placed all ecclesiastical jurisdiction and legislative power in the hands of the State, while the second prescribed a course of doctrine and discipline, from which no variation was legally permissible. For the nation at large, the system which was thus adopted was no doubt a wise and a healthy one. Single-handed, and unsupported by any of the statesmen or divines of their time, the Queen and the Primate forced on the warring religions a sort of armed truce. The main principles of the Reformation were accepted, but the zeal of the ultra-reformers was held at bay. The Bible was left open, private discussion was unrestrained, but the warfare of pulpit against pulpit was silenced by the licensing of preachers. An outer conformity, and attendance at public worship, was exacted from all; but the changes in ritual, by which the zealots of Geneva gave prominence to the radical features of the religious change which was passing over the country, were steadily resisted. While England was struggling for existence,

1583
to
1603

this balanced attitude of the Crown reflected faithfully enough the balanced attitude of the nation; but with the death of Mary Stuart the danger was over, and a marked change in public sentiment became at once observable. Unhappily no corresponding change took place in the Queen. With the religious enthusiasm which was growing up around her she had no sympathy whatever. Her passion was for moderation, her aim was simply civil order; and both order and moderation were threatened, as she held, by the knot of clerical bigots who gathered from this hour under the banner of Presbyterianism. Of these Thomas Cartwright was the chief. He had studied at Geneva; he returned with a fanatical faith in Calvinism, and in the system of Church government which Calvin had devised; and as Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge he used to the full the opportunities which his chair gave him of propagating his opinions. No leader of a religious party ever deserved less of after sympathy than Cartwright. He was unquestionably learned and devout, but his bigotry was that of a mediæval inquisitor. The relics of the old ritual, the cross in baptism, the surplice, the giving of a ring in marriage, were to him not merely distasteful, as they were to the Puritans at large, they were idolatrous and the mark of the beast. His declamations against ceremonies and superstition however had little weight with Elizabeth or her Primates; what scared them was his reckless advocacy of a scheme of ecclesiastical government which placed the State beneath the feet of the Church. The absolute rule of bishops, indeed, he denounced as begotten of the devil; but the absolute rule of Presbyters he held to be established by the word of God. For the Church modelled after the fashion of Geneva he claimed an authority which surpassed the wildest dreams of the masters of the Vatican. All spiritual power and jurisdiction, the decreeing of doctrine, the ordering of ceremonies, lay wholly, according to his Calvinistic creed, in the hands of the ministers of the Church. To them, too, belonged the supervision of public morals. In an ordered arrangement of classes and synods, they were to govern their flocks, to regulate their own order, to decide in matters of faith, to administer "discipline." Their weapon was excommunication, and they were responsible for its use to none but Christ. The province of the civil ruler was simply "to see their decrees executed and to punish the contemners of them," for the spirit of such a system as this naturally excluded all toleration of practice or belief. With the despotism of a Hildebrand, Cartwright combined the cruelty of a Torquemada. Not only was Presbyterianism to be established as the one legal form of Church government, but all other forms, Episcopalian and Separatist, were to be ruthlessly put down. For heresy there was the punishment of death. Never had the doctrine of persecution been urged with such a blind and reckless ferocity. "I deny," wrote Cartwright, "that upon repentance there ought to follow any pardon of death. . . . Heretics ought to be put to death now. If this be

1588 bloody and extreme, I am content to be so counted with the Holy
to Ghost.”

1603

Hooker

Opinions such as these might wisely have been left to be refuted by the good sense of the people itself. They found, in fact, a crushing answer in the “Ecclesiastical Polity” of Richard Hooker, a clergyman who had been Master of the Temple, but whose distaste for the controversies of its pulpit drove him from London to a Wiltshire vicarage at Boscombe, which he exchanged at a later time for the parsonage of Bishopsbourne, among the quiet meadows of Kent. The largeness of temper which characterized all the nobler minds of his day, the philosophic breadth which is seen as clearly in Shakspeare as in Bacon, was united in Hooker with a grandeur and stateliness of style, which raised him to the highest rank among English prose writers. Divine as he was, his spirit and method were philosophical rather than theological. Against the ecclesiastical dogmatism of Cartwright he set the authority of reason. He abandoned the narrow ground of Scriptural argument to base his conclusions on the general principles of moral and political science, on the eternal obligations of natural law. The Presbyterian system rested on the assumption that an immutable rule for human action, in all matters relating to religion, to worship, and to the discipline and constitution of the Church, was laid down, and only laid down, in Scripture. Hooker urged that a Divine order exists, not in written revelation only, but in the moral relations, and the social and political institutions of men. He claimed for human reason the province of determining the laws of this order; of distinguishing between what is changeable and unchangeable in them, between what is eternal and what is temporary in Scripture itself. It was easy for him to push on to the field of theological controversy which Cartwright had chosen, to show historically that no form of Church government had ever been of indispensable obligation, and that ritual observances had in all ages been left to the discretion of Churches, and determined by the differences of times. But the truth on which he rested his argument against the dogmatism of the Presbyterian is of far higher value than his argument itself; for it is the truth against which ecclesiastical dogmatism, whether of the Presbyterian or the Catholic, must always shatter itself. The “Ecclesiastical Polity” appealed rather to the broad sense and intelligence of Englishmen than to the learning of divines, but its appeal was hardly needed. Popular as the Presbyterian system became in Scotland, it never took any popular hold on England; it remained to the last a clerical rather than a national creed, and even in the moment of its seeming triumph under the Commonwealth it was rejected by every part of England save London and Lancashire. But the bold challenge to the Government which was delivered in a daring “Admonition to the Parliament” had raised a panic among English statesmen and prelates which cut off all hopes of a quiet appeal to reason. It is probable that, but for the storm which

1594

1572

Cartwright raised, the steady growth of general discontent with the ceremonial usages he denounced would have brought about their abolition. The Parliament of 1571 not only refused to bind the clergy to subscription to three articles on the Supremacy, the form of Church government, and the power of the Church to ordain rites and ceremonies, but favoured the project of reforming the Liturgy by the omission of the superstitious practices. But with the appearance of the "Admonition" this natural progress of opinion abruptly ceased. The moderate statesmen who had pressed for a change in ritual withdrew from union with a party which revived the worst pretensions of the Papacy. Parker's hand pressed heavier than before on nonconforming ministers, while Elizabeth was provoked to a measure which forms the worst blot on her reign.

1583
to
1603

Her establishment of the Ecclesiastical Commission in fact converted the religious truce into a spiritual despotism. From being a temporary board which represented the Royal Supremacy in matters ecclesiastical, the Commission was now turned into a permanent body wielding the almost unlimited powers of the Crown. All opinions or acts contrary to the Statutes of Supremacy and Uniformity fell within its cognizance. A right of deprivation placed the clergy at its mercy. It had power to alter or amend the Statutes of Colleges or Schools. Not only heresy, and schism, and nonconformity, but incest or aggravated adultery were held to fall within its scope: its means of enquiry were left without limit, and it might fine or imprison at its will. By the mere establishment of such a Court half the work of the Reformation was undone; but the large number of civilians on the board seemed to furnish some security against the excess of ecclesiastical tyranny. Of its forty-four commissioners however few actually took any part in its proceedings; and the powers of the Commission were practically left in the hands of the successive Primates. No Archbishop of Canterbury since the days of Augustine had wielded an authority so vast, so utterly despotic, as that of Parker and Whitgift and Bancroft and Abbot and Laud. The most terrible feature of their spiritual tyranny was its wholly personal character. The old symbols of doctrine were gone, and the lawyers had not yet stepped in to protect the clergy by defining the exact limits of the new. The result was that at the Commission-board at Lambeth the Primates created their own tests of doctrine with an utter indifference to those created by law. In one instance Parker deprived a vicar of his benefice for a denial of the verbal inspiration of the Bible. Nor did the successive Archbishops care greatly if the test was a varying or a conflicting one. Whitgift strove to force on the Church the Calvinistic supralapsarianism of his Lambeth Articles. Bancroft, who followed him, was as earnest in enforcing his anti-Calvinistic dogma of the Divine right of the episcopate. Abbot had no mercy for Erastians. Laud had none for anti-Erastians. It is no wonder that the Ecclesiastical Commission, which these men represented, soon stank in the nostrils of the

The
Ecclesi-
astical
Com-
mission
1583

1583
to
1603

English clergy. Its establishment however marked the adoption of a distinct policy on the part of the Crown, and its efforts were backed by stern measures of repression. All preaching or reading in private houses was forbidden; and in spite of the refusal of Parliament to enforce the requirement of them by law, subscription to the Three Articles was exacted from every member of the clergy.

The
Separatists

For the moment these measures were crowned with success. The movement under Cartwright was checked; Cartwright himself was driven from his Professorship; and an outer uniformity of worship was more and more brought about by the steady pressure of the Commission. The old liberty which had been allowed in London and the other Protestant parts of the kingdom was no longer permitted to exist. The leading Puritan clergy, whose nonconformity had hitherto been winked at, were called upon to submit to the surplice, and to make the sign of the cross. The remonstrances of the country gentry availed as little as the protest of Lord Burleigh himself to protect two hundred of the best ministers, who were driven from their parsonages on their refusal to subscribe to the Three Articles. But the result of this persecution was simply to give a fresh life and popularity to the doctrines which it aimed at crushing, by drawing together two currents of opinion which were in themselves perfectly distinct. The Presbyterian platform of Church discipline had as yet been embraced by the clergy only, and by few among the clergy. On the other hand, the wish for a reform in the Liturgy, the dislike of "superstitious usages," of the use of the surplice, the sign of the cross in baptism, the gift of the ring in marriage, the posture of kneeling at the Lord's Supper, was shared by a large number of the clergy and laity alike. At the opening of Elizabeth's reign almost all the higher Churchmen but Parker were opposed to them, and a motion for their abolition in Convocation was lost but by a single vote. The temper of the country gentlemen on this subject was indicated by that of Parliament; and it was well known that the wisest of the Queen's Councillors, Burleigh, Walsingham, and Knollys, were at one in this matter with the gentry. If their common persecution did not wholly succeed in fusing these two sections of religious opinion into one, it at any rate gained for the Presbyterians a general sympathy on the part of the Puritans, which raised them from a clerical clique into a popular party. Nor were the consequences of the persecution limited to the strengthening of the Presbyterians. The "Separatists," who were beginning to withdraw from attendance at public worship, on the ground that the very existence of a national Church was contrary to the Word of God, grew quickly from a few scattered zealots to twenty thousand souls. Congregations of these Independents—or, as they were called at this time, from the name of their founder, Brownists—formed rapidly throughout England; and persecution on the part of the Bishops and the Presbyterians, to both of whom their opinions were equally hateful, drove flocks of refugees over sea. So great a future awaited

one of these congregations that we may pause to get a glimpse of "a poor people" in Lincolnshire and the neighbourhood, who "being enlightened by the Word of God," and their members "urged with the yoke of subscription," had been led "to see further." They rejected ceremonies as relics of idolatry, the rule of bishops as unscriptural, and joined themselves, "as the Lord's free people," into "a church estate on the fellowship of the Gospel." Choosing John Robinson as their minister, they felt their way forward to the great principle of liberty of conscience; and asserted their Christian right "to walk in all the ways which God had made known or should make known to them." Their meetings or "conventicles" soon drew down the heavy hand of the law, and the little company resolved to seek a refuge in other lands; but their first attempt at flight was prevented, and when they made another, their wives and children were seized at the very moment of entering the ship. At last, however, the magistrates gave a contemptuous assent to their project; they were in fact "glad to be rid of them at any price;" and the fugitives found shelter at Amsterdam. "They knew they were pilgrims and looked not much on these things, but lifted up their eyes to Heaven, their dearest country, and quieted their spirits." Among this little band of exiles were those who were to become famous at a later time as the Pilgrim Fathers of the *Mayflower*.

1593
to
1603

It was easy to be "rid" of the Brownists; but the political danger of the course on which the Crown had entered was seen in the rise of a spirit of vigorous opposition, such as had not made its appearance since the accession of the Tudors. The growing power of public opinion received a striking recognition in the struggle which bears the name of the "Martin Marprelate controversy." The Puritans had from the first appealed by their pamphlets from the Crown to the people, and Whitgift bore witness to their influence on opinion by his efforts to gag the Press. The regulations of the Star-Chamber for this purpose are memorable as the first step in the long struggle of government after government to check the liberty of printing. The irregular censorship which had long existed was now finally organized. Printing was restricted to London and the two Universities, the number of printers reduced, and all candidates for license to print placed under the supervision of the Company of Stationers. Every publication too, great or small, had to receive the approbation of the Primate or the Bishop of London. The first result of this system of repression was the appearance, in the very year of the Armada, of a series of anonymous pamphlets bearing the significant name of "Martin Marprelate," and issued from a secret press which found refuge from the Royal pursuivants in the country-houses of the gentry. The press was at last seized; and the suspected authors of these scurrilous libels, Penry, a young Welshman, and a minister named Udall, died, the one in prison, the other on the scaffold. But the virulence and boldness of their language produced a powerful

Martin
Marpre-
late

1585

1583

1583
to
1603

effect, for it was impossible under the system of Elizabeth to "mar" the bishops without attacking the Crown; and a new age of political liberty was felt to be at hand when Martin Marprelate forced the political and ecclesiastical measures of the Government into the arena of public discussion. The suppression, indeed, of these pamphlets was far from damping the courage of the Presbyterians. Cartwright, who had been appointed by Lord Leicester to the mastership of an hospital at Warwick, was bold enough to organize his system of Church discipline among the clergy of that county and of Northamptonshire. The example was widely followed; and the general gatherings of the whole ministerial body of the clergy, and the smaller assemblies for each diocese or shire, which in the Presbyterian scheme bore the name of Synods and Classes, began to be held in many parts of England for the purposes of debate and consultation. The new organization was quickly suppressed indeed, but Cartwright was saved from the banishment which Whitgift demanded by a promise of submission; and the struggle, transferred to the higher sphere of the Parliament, widened into the great contest for liberty under James, and the Civil War under his successor.

SECTION II.—THE FIRST OF THE STUARTS, 1604—1623

[*Authorities.*—The various Calendars of State Papers and the "Parliamentary History of England" are the most useful sources. For James I., his own Works. Prothero, "Statutes and Constitutional Documents," contains the principal documents of the reign. For Bacon, Spedding, "Life and Letters of Lord Bacon." Among modern historians, Gardiner, "History of England," is a mine of information and must be regarded as the standard work on the period. Ranke, "History of England," is especially valuable for foreign relations, and is far more readable than Gardiner. For Gunpowder Plot, see Gerard, "What was Gunpowder Plot?" and Gardiner's answer, "What Gunpowder Plot was." For the divine right of kings, see Figgis, "Divine Right of Kings."]

The
Catholic
Reaction

1559

To judge fairly the attitude and policy of the English Puritans, that is of three-fourths of the Protestants of England, at this moment, we must cursorily review the fortunes of Protestantism during the reign of Elizabeth. At the Queen's accession, the success of the Reformation seemed almost everywhere secure. Already triumphant in the north of Germany, the Pacification of Passau was the signal for a beginning of its conquest of the south. The Emperor Maximilian was believed to be wavering in the faith. Throughout Austria and Hungary, the nobles and burghers abandoned Catholicism in a mass. A Venetian ambassador estimated the German Catholics at little more than one-tenth of the whole population of Germany. The Scandinavian kingdoms embraced the new faith, and it mastered at once the eastern and western States of Europe. In Poland the majority of the nobles became Protestants. Scotland flung off Catholicism under Mary,

1604
to
1623

and England veered round again to Protestantism under Elizabeth. At the same moment, the death of Henry the Second opened a way for the rapid diffusion of the new doctrines in France. Only where the dead hand of Spain lay heavy, in Castile, in Arragon, or in Italy, was the Reformation thoroughly crushed out; and even the dead hand of Spain failed to crush heresy in the Low Countries. But at the very instant of its seeming triumph, the advance of the new religion was suddenly arrested. The first twenty years of Elizabeth's reign were a period of suspense. The progress of Protestantism gradually ceased. It wasted its strength in theological controversies and persecutions, above all in the bitter and venomous discussions between the Churches which followed Luther and the Churches which followed Calvin. It was degraded and weakened by the prostitution of the Reformation to political ends, by the greed and worthlessness of the German princes who espoused its cause, by the factious lawlessness of the nobles in Poland, and of the Huguenots in France. Meanwhile the Papacy succeeded in rallying the Catholic world round the Council of Trent. The Roman Church, enfeebled and corrupted by the triumph of ages, felt at last the uses of adversity. Her faith was settled and defined. The most crying among the ecclesiastical abuses which had provoked the movement of the Reformation were sternly put down. The enthusiasm of the Protestants roused a counter enthusiasm among their opponents; new religious orders rose to meet the wants of the day; the Capuchins became the preachers of Catholicism, the Jesuits became not only its preachers, but its directors, its schoolmasters, its missionaries, its diplomatists. Their organization, their blind obedience, their real ability, their fanatical zeal galvanized the pulpit, the school, the confessional into a new life. If the Protestants had enjoyed the profitable monopoly of martyrdom at the opening of the century, the Catholics won a fair share of it as soon as the disciples of Loyola came to the front. The tracts which pictured the tortures of Campion and Southwell roused much the same fire at Toledo or Vienna as the pages of Foxe had roused in England. Even learning passed gradually over to the side of the older faith. Bellarmine, the greatest of controversialists at this time, Baronius, the most erudite of Church historians, were both Catholics. With a growing inequality of strength such as this, we can hardly wonder that the tide was seen at last to turn. A few years before the fight with the Armada Catholicism began definitely to win ground. Southern Germany, where the Austrian House, so long lukewarm in its faith, had at last become zealots in its defence, was the first country to be re-Catholicized. The success of Socinianism in Poland severed that kingdom from any real communion with the general body of the Protestant Churches; and these again were more and more divided into two warring camps by the controversies about the Sacrament and Free Will. Everywhere the Jesuits won converts, and their peaceful victories were soon backed by the arm of Spain. In the

1604
to
1623

fierce struggle which followed, Philip was undoubtedly worsted. England was saved by its defeat of the Armada; the United Provinces of the Netherlands rose into a great Protestant power through their own dogged heroism and the genius of William the Silent. France was rescued, at the moment when all hope seemed gone, by the unconquerable energy of Henry of Navarre. But even in its defeat Catholicism gained ground. In the Low Countries, the Reformation was driven from the Walloon provinces, from Brabant, and from Flanders. In France, Henry the Fourth found himself obliged to purchase Paris by a mass; and the conversion of the King was followed by a quiet dissolution of the Huguenot party. Nobles and scholars alike forsook Protestantism; and though the Reformation remained dominant south of the Loire, it lost all hope of winning the country as a whole to its side.

The
Gun-
powder
Plot

At the death of Elizabeth, therefore, the temper of every Protestant, whether in England or abroad, was that of a man who, after cherishing the hope of a crowning victory, is forced to look on at a crushing and irremediable defeat. The dream of a reformation of the universal Church was utterly at an end. The borders of Protestantism were narrowing every day, nor was there a sign that the triumph of the Papacy was arrested. The accession of James indeed raised the hopes of the Catholics in England itself; he had intrigued for their support before the Queen's death, and their persecution was relaxed for a while after he had mounted the throne. But it soon began again with even greater severity than of old, and six thousand Catholics were presented as recusants in a single year. Hopeless of aid from abroad, or of success in an open rising at home, a small knot of desperate men, with Robert Catesby, who had been engaged in the plot of Essex, at their head, resolved to destroy at a blow both King and Parliament. Barrels of powder were placed in a cellar beneath the Parliament House; and while waiting for the fifth of November, when the Parliament was summoned to meet, the plans of the little group widened into a formidable conspiracy. Catholics of greater fortune, such as Sir Everard Digby and Francis Tresham, were admitted to their confidence, and supplied money for the larger projects they designed. Arms were bought in Flanders, horses were held in readiness, a meeting of Catholic gentlemen was brought about under show of a hunting party to serve as the beginning of a rising. The destruction of the King was to be followed by the seizure of the King's children and an open revolt, in which aid might be called for from the Spaniards in Flanders. Wonderful as was the secrecy with which the plot was concealed, the cowardice of Tresham at the last moment gave a clue to it by a letter to Lord Monteagle, his relative, which warned him to absent himself from the Parliament on the fatal day; and further information brought about the discovery of the cellar and of Guido Fawkes, a soldier of fortune, who was charged with the custody of it. The hunting party broke up in despair, the conspirators were chased from

1604

county to county, and either killed or sent to the block, and Garnet, the Provincial of the English Jesuits, was brought to solemn trial. He had shrunk from all part in the plot, but its existence had been made known to him by another Jesuit, Greenway, and horror-stricken as he represented himself to have been he had kept the secret and left the Parliament to its doom. We can hardly wonder that a frenzy of horror and dread filled the minds of English Protestants at such a discovery. What intensified the dread was a sense of defection and uncertainty within the pale of the Church of England itself. No men could be more opposed in their tendencies to one another than the High Churchmen, such as Laud, and the English Latitudinarian, such as Hales. But to the ordinary English Protestant both Latitudinarian and High Churchmen were equally hateful. To him the struggle with the Papacy was not one for compromise or comprehension. It was a struggle between light and darkness, between life and death. Every Protestant doctrine, from the least to the greatest, was equally true, and equally sacred. No innovation in faith or worship was of small account, if it tended in the direction of Rome. Ceremonies, which in an hour of triumph might have been allowed as solaces to weak brethren, became insufferable when they were turned by weak brethren into a means of drawing nearer to the enemy in the hour of defeat. The peril was too close at hand to allow of compromises. Now that falsehood was gaining ground, the only security for truth was to draw a hard and fast line between truth and falsehood. It is a temper such as this that we trace in the Millenary Petition (as it was called), which was presented to James the First on his accession by nearly eight hundred clergymen, a tenth of the whole number in his realm. Its tone was not Presbyterian, but strictly Puritan. It asked for no change in the government or organization of the Church, but for a reform in the Church courts, the provision and training of godly ministers, and the suppression of "Popish usages" in the Book of Common Prayer. Even those who were most opposed to the Presbyterian scheme agreed as to the necessity of some concession on points of this sort. "Why," asked Bacon, "should the civil state be purged and restored by good and wholesome laws made every three years in Parliament assembled, devising remedies as fast as time breedeth mischief; and contrariwise the ecclesiastical state still continue upon the dregs of time, and receive no alteration these forty-five years or more?" A general expectation, in fact, prevailed that, now the Queen's opposition was removed, something would be done. But, different as his theological temper was from the purely secular temper of Elizabeth, her successor was equally resolute against all changes in Church matters.

No sovereign could have jarred against the conception of an English ruler which had grown up under the Tudors more utterly than James the First. His big head, his slobbering tongue, his quilted clothes, his rickety legs, his goggle eyes, stood out in as

1604
to
1623

1603

The
Divine
Right
of Kings

1604 grotesque a contrast with all that men recalled of Henry or
to Elizabeth as his gabble and rodomontade, his want of personal
1623 dignity, his vulgar buffoonery, his coarseness, his pedantry, his contemptible cowardice. Under this ridiculous exterior however lay a man of much natural ability, a ripe scholar, with a considerable fund of shrewdness, of mother wit, and ready repartee. His canny humour lights up the political and theological controversies of the time with quaint incisive phrases, with puns and epigrams and touches of irony, which still retain their savour. His reading, especially in theological matters, was extensive; and he was a voluminous author on subjects which ranged from Predestinarianism to tobacco. But his shrewdness and learning only left him, in the phrase of Henry the Fourth, "the wisest fool in Christendom." He had the temper of a pedant; and with it a pedant's love of theories, and a pedant's inability to bring his theories into any relation with actual facts. All might have gone well had he confined himself to speculations about witchcraft, about predestination, about the noxiousness of smoking. Unhappily for England and for his successor, he clung yet more passionately to two theories which contained within them the seeds of a death-struggle between his people and the Crown. The first was that of a Divine right of Kings. Even before his accession to the English throne, he had formulated the theory of an absolute royalty in his work on "The True Law of Free Monarchy;" and announced that, "although a good King will frame his actions to be according to law, yet he is not bound thereto, but of his own will and for example-giving to his subjects." The notion was a wholly new one; and like most of James's notions was founded simply on a blunder, or at the best on a play upon words. "An absolute King," or "an absolute monarchy," meant, with the Tudor statesmen who used the phrase, a sovereign or rule complete in themselves, and independent of all foreign or Papal interference. James chose to regard the words as implying the monarch's freedom from all control by law, or from responsibility to anything but his own royal will. The King's blunder however became a system of government, a doctrine which bishops preached from the pulpit, and for which brave men laid their heads on the block. The Church was quick to adopt its sovereign's discovery. Convocation in its book of Canons denounced as a fatal error the assertion that "all civil power, jurisdiction, and authority were first derived from the people and disordered multitude, or either is originally still in them, or else is deduced by their consent naturally from them, and is not God's ordinance originally descending from Him and depending upon Him." In strict accordance with James's theory, these doctors declared sovereignty in its origin to be the prerogative of birth-right, and inculcated passive obedience to the monarch as a religious obligation. Cowell, a civilian, followed up the discoveries of Convocation by an announcement that "the King is above the law by his absolute power," and that "notwithstanding his oath

he may alter and suspend any particular law that seemeth hurtful to the public estate." The book was suppressed on the remonstrance of the House of Commons, but the party of passive obedience grew fast. A few years before the King's death, the University of Oxford decreed solemnly that "it was in no case lawful for subjects to make use of force against their princes, or to appear offensively or defensively in the field against them." The King's "arrogant speeches," if they roused resentment in the Parliaments to which they were addressed, created by sheer force of repetition a certain belief in the arbitrary right they challenged for the Crown. We may give one instance of their tone from a speech delivered in the Star-Chamber. "As it is atheism and blasphemy to dispute what God can do," said James. "so it is presumption and a high contempt in a subject to dispute what a King can do, or to say that a King cannot do this or that." A few years after his accession his words had startled English ears with a sense of coming danger to the national liberty. "If the practice should follow the positions," was the comment of a thoughtful observer, "we are not likely to leave to our successors that freedom we received from our forefathers."

It is necessary to weigh, throughout the course of James's reign, this aggressive attitude of the Crown, if we would rightly judge what seems at first sight to be an aggressive tone in some of the proceedings of the Parliaments. With new claims of power such as these before them, to have stood still would have been ruin. The claim, too, was one which jarred against all that was noblest in the Puritan tone of the time. The temper of the Puritan was eminently a temper of law. The diligence with which he searched the Scriptures sprang from his earnestness to discover a Divine Will which in all things, great or small, he might implicitly obey. But this implicit obedience was reserved for the Divine Will alone; for human ordinances derived their strength only from their correspondence with the revealed law of God. The Puritan was bound by his very religion to examine every claim made on his civil and spiritual obedience by the powers that be; and to own or reject the claim, as it accorded with the higher duty which he owed to God. "In matters of faith," Mrs. Hutchinson tells us of her husband, "his reason always submitted to the Word of God; but in all other things the greatest names in the world would not lead him without reason." It was plain that an impassable gulf parted such a temper as this from the temper of unquestioning devotion to the Crown which James demanded. It was a temper not only legal, but even pedantic in its legality, intolerant from its very sense of a moral order and law of the lawlessness and disorder of a personal tyranny; a temper of criticism, of judgment, and, if need be, of stubborn and unconquerable resistance; of a resistance which sprang, not from the disdain of authority, but from the Puritan's devotion to an authority higher than that of Kings. But if the theory of a Divine right of Kings was certain to rouse against

1604
to
1623

The
Divine
Right of
Bishops

1604
to
1623

it all the nobler energies of Puritanism, there was something which roused its nobler and its pettier instincts of resistance alike in James's second theory of a Divine right of Bishops. Elizabeth's conception of her Ecclesiastical Supremacy had been a sore stumbling-block to her subjects, but Elizabeth at least regarded the Supremacy simply as a branch of her ordinary prerogative. Not only were the clergy her subjects, but they were more her subjects than the laity. She treated them in fact as her predecessors had treated the Jews. If she allowed nobody else to abuse or to rob them, she robbed and abused them herself to her heart's content. But the theory which James held as to Church and State was as different from that of Elizabeth, as the theological bent of his mind was different from her secular temper. His patristic reading had left behind it the belief in a Divine right of Bishops, as sacred and as absolute as the Divine right of Kings. Unbroken episcopal succession and hereditary regal succession were with the new sovereign the inviolable bases of Church and State. The two systems confirmed and supported each other. "No bishop, no King," ran the famous formula which embodied the King's theory. But behind his intellectual convictions lay a host of prejudices derived from his youth. The Scotch Presbyters had insulted and frightened him in the early days of his reign, and he chose to confound Puritanism with Presbyterianism. No prejudice however was really required to suggest his course. In itself it was logical, and consistent with the premisses from which it started. The very ceremonies which the Puritans denounced were ceremonies which had plenty of authority in the writings of the Fathers. That they were offensive to consciences seemed to the King no reason whatever for suppressing them. It was for the Christian to submit, as it was for the subject to submit, and to leave these high matters to bishops and princes for decision. If James accepted the Millenarian Petition, and summoned a conference of prelates and Puritan divines at Hampton Court, it was not for any real discussion of the grievances alleged, but for the display of his own theological learning. The bishops had the wit to declare that the insults he showered on their opponents were dictated by the Holy Ghost. The Puritans still ventured to dispute his infallibility. James broke up the conference with a threat which revealed the policy of the Crown. "I will make them conform," he said of the remonstrants, "or I will harry them out of the land."

The
Crown
and the
Parlia-
ment

It is only by thoroughly realizing the temper of the nation on religious and civil subjects, and the temper of the King, that we can understand the long Parliamentary conflict which occupied the whole of James's reign. But to make its details intelligible we must briefly review the relations which existed at his accession between the two Houses and the Crown. In an earlier part of this work we have noted the contrast between Wolsey and Cromwell in their dealings with the Parliament. The wary prescience of the first had seen in it, even in its degradation under the Tudors, the

memorial of an older freedom, and a centre of national resistance to the new despotism which Henry was establishing, should the nation ever rouse itself to resist. Never perhaps was English liberty in such deadly peril as when Wolsey resolved on the practical suppression of the two Houses. But the bolder genius of Cromwell set contemptuously aside the apprehensions of his predecessor. His confidence in the power of the Crown revived the Parliament as an easy and manageable instrument of tyranny. The old forms of constitutional freedom were turned to the profit of the Royal despotism, and a revolution which for the moment left England absolutely at Henry's feet was wrought out by a series of Parliamentary Statutes. Throughout Henry's reign Cromwell's confidence seemed justified by the spirit of slavish submission which pervaded the Houses. On only one occasion did the Commons refuse to pass a bill brought forward by the Crown. But the effect of the great religious change for which Cromwell's measures made room began to be felt during the minority of Edward the Sixth; and the debates and divisions on the religious reaction which Mary pressed on the Parliament were many and violent. A great step forward was marked by the effort of the Crown to neutralize by "management" an opposition which it could no longer overawe. An unscrupulous use of the Royal prerogative packed the Parliament with nominees of the Crown. Twenty-two new boroughs were created under Edward, fourteen under Mary; some, indeed, places entitled to representation by their wealth and population, but the bulk of them small towns or hamlets which lay wholly at the disposal of the Royal Council. But the increasing pressure of the two Houses was seen in the further step on which Edward's Council ventured in issuing a circular to the Sheriffs, in which they were ordered to set all freedom of election aside. Where the Council recommended "men of learning and wisdom," in other words men compliant with its will, there its directions were to be "regarded and well followed." Elizabeth, though with greater caution, adopted the system of her two predecessors, both in the creation of boroughs and the recommendation of candidates; but her keen political instinct soon perceived the uselessness of both expedients. She fell back as far as she could on Wolsey's policy of practical abolition, and summoned Parliaments at longer and longer intervals. By rigid economy, by a policy of balance and peace, she strove, and for a long time successfully strove, to avoid the necessity of assembling them at all. But Mary of Scotland and Philip of Spain proved friends to English liberty in its sorest need. The death-struggle with Catholicism forced Elizabeth to have recourse to her Parliament, and as she was driven to appeal for increasing supplies the tone of the Parliament rose higher and higher. On the question of taxation or monopolies her fierce spirit was forced to give way to its demands. On the question of religion she refused all concession, and England was driven to await a change of system from her successor. But it is clear, from the earlier acts of his reign, that

1604
to
1623

1604 James had long before his accession been preparing for a struggle
to with the Houses, rather than for a policy of concession. During the
1623 Queen's reign, the power of Parliament had sprung mainly from
the continuance of the war, and from the necessity under which
the Crown lay of appealing to it for supplies. It is fair to the war
party in Elizabeth's Council to remember that they were fighting,
not merely for Protestantism abroad, but for constitutional liberty
at home. When Essex overrode Burleigh's counsels of peace, the
old minister pointed to the words of the Bible, "a bloodthirsty
man shall not live out half his days." But Essex and his friends had
nobler motives for their policy of war than a thirst for blood; as
James had meaner motives for his policy of peace than a hatred of
bloodshedding. The peace which he hastened to conclude with
1604 Spain was intended to free the Crown from its dependence on the
Parliament; and had he fallen back after the close of the war on
Elizabeth's policy of economy, he might yet have succeeded in his
aim. But the debt left by the war was only swollen by his profligate
extravagance; and peace was hardly concluded when he was
forced to appeal once more to his Parliament for supplies.

James and the Parlia-
ment ment
The Parliament of 1604 met in another mood from that of any
Parliament which had met for a hundred years. Short as had
been the time since his accession, the temper of the King had
already disclosed itself; and men were dwelling ominously on the
claims of absolutism in Church and State which were constantly on
the Royal lips. Above all, the hopes of religious concessions to
which the Puritans had clung had been dashed to the ground in the
Hampton Court Conference; and of the squires and burgesses
who made up the new House of Commons three-fourths were in
sympathy Puritan. The energy which marked their action from
the beginning shows that the insults which James had heaped on
the Puritan divines had stirred the temper of the nation at large.
The first step of the Commons was to name a committee to frame
bills for the redress of the more crying ecclesiastical grievances;
and the rejection of the measures they proposed was at once
followed by an outspoken address to the King. The Parliament, it
said, had come together in a spirit of peace: "Our desire was of
peace only, and our device of unity." Their aim had been to
extinguish the long-standing dissension among the ministers, and
to preserve uniformity by the abandonment of "a few ceremonies
of small importance," by the redress of some ecclesiastical abuses,
and by the establishment of an efficient training for a preaching
clergy. If they had waived their right to deal with these matters
during the old age of Elizabeth, they asserted it now. "Let your
Majesty be pleased to receive public information from your
Commons in Parliament, as well of the abuses in the Church, as in
the Civil State and Government." The claim of absolutism was
met in words which sound like a prelude to the Petition of Right.
"Your Majesty would be misinformed," said their address, "if
any man should deliver that the Kings of England have any

absolute power in themselves either to alter religion, or to make any laws concerning the same, otherwise than as in temporal causes, by consent of Parliament." The address was met by a petulant scolding from James; and the bishops, secure of the support of the Crown, replied by an act of bold defiance. The Canons enacted in the Convocation of 1604 bound the clergy to subscribe to the Three Articles, which Parliament had long before refused to render obligatory on them; and compelled all curates and lecturers to conform strictly to the rubrics of the prayer-book on pain of deprivation. In the following winter, three hundred of the Puritan clergy were driven from their livings for non-compliance with these requirements. The only help came from an unlooked-for quarter. The jealousy which had always prevailed between the civil and ecclesiastical courts united with the general resentment of the country at these ecclesiastical usurpations to spur the Judges to an attack on the High Commission. By a series of decisions on appeal they limited its boundless jurisdiction, and restricted its powers of imprisonment to cases of schism and heresy. But the Judges were of little avail against the Crown; and James was resolute in his support of the bishops. Fortunately his prodigality had already in a few years of peace doubled the debt which Elizabeth had left after fifteen years of war; and the course of illegal taxation on which he entered was far from supplying the deficit of the Exchequer. His first great constitutional innovation was the imposition of Customs duties on almost all kinds of merchandise, imported or exported. The imposition was not, indeed, without precedent. A duty on imports which had been introduced in one or two instances under Mary had been extended by Elizabeth to currants and wine; but the impost, trivial in itself, had been pushed no farther, nor had it ever been claimed or regarded as more than an exceptional measure of finance. Had Elizabeth cared to extend it, her course would probably have been gradual and tentative, and have aimed at escaping public observation. But James was a fanatical believer in the rights and power of his crown, and he cared quite as much to assert his absolute authority over impositions as to fill his Treasury. A case therefore was brought before the Exchequer Chamber, and the judgment of the Court asserted the King's right to levy what Customs duties he would at his pleasure. "All customs," said the Judges, "are the effects of foreign commerce, but all affairs of commerce and treaties with foreign nations belong to the King's absolute power. He therefore, who has power over the cause, must have power over the effect." The importance of a decision which freed the Crown from the necessity of resorting to Parliament was seen keenly enough by James. English commerce was growing fast, and English merchants were fighting their way to the Spice Islands, and establishing settlements in the dominions of the Mogul. The judgment gave him a revenue which was sure to grow rapidly, and he acted on it with decision. A Royal proclamation imposed a

1604
to
1623

1608

1604 system of Customs duties on all articles of export and import. But
 to if the new duties came in fast, the Royal debt grew faster. The
 1623 peace expenditure of James exceeded the war expenditure of
 Elizabeth, and necessity forced on the King a fresh assembling of
 Parliament. He forbade the Commons to enter on the subject of
 the new duties, but their remonstrance was none the less vigorous.
 "Finding that your Majesty without advice or counsel of Parlia-
 ment hath lately in time of peace set both greater impositions and
 more in number than any of your noble ancestors did ever in time
 of war," they prayed "that all impositions set without the assent
 1610 of Parliament may be quite abolished and taken away," and that
 "a law be made to declare that all impositions set upon your
 people, their goods or merchandise, save only by common consent
 in Parliament, are and shall be void." From the new question of
 illegal taxation they turned, with no less earnestness, to the older
 question of ecclesiastical reform. Before granting the supply which
 the Crown required, they demanded that the jurisdiction of the
 High Commission should be regulated by Statute, in other words
 that ecclesiastical matters should be recognized as within the
 cognizance of Parliament; and that the deprived ministers should
 again be suffered to preach. Whatever concessions James might
 offer on the subject of the Customs, he would allow no interference
 with his ecclesiastical prerogative; the Parliament was dissolved,
 and four years passed before the financial straits of the Govern-
 ment forced James to face the two Houses again. But the spirit
 of resistance was now fairly roused. Never had an election stirred
 so much popular passion as that of 1614. In every case where
 rejection was possible, the Court candidates were rejected. All the
 1614 leading members of the Country party, or as we should call it now
 the Opposition, were again returned. But three hundred of the
 members were wholly new men; and among these we note for the
 first time the names of the great leaders in the later struggle with
 the Crown. Somersetshire returned John Pym; Yorkshire, Thomas
 Wentworth; St. Germain's, John Eliot. Signs of an unprecedented
 excitement were seen in the vehement cheering and hissing which
 for the first time marked the proceedings of the Commons. But
 the policy of the Parliament was precisely the same as that of its
 predecessors. The Commons refused to grant supplies till grievances
 had been redressed, and fixed on that of illegal taxation as the first
 to be amended. Unluckily the inexperience of the bulk of the
 members led them into quarrelling on a point of privilege with the
 Lords; and the King, who had been frightened beyond his wont
 at the vehemence of their tone and language, seized on the quarrel
 as a pretext for their dissolution.

The
 Royal
 Despot- sent to the Tower; and the terror and resentment which it had
 ism roused in the King's mind were seen in the obstinacy with which
 1614 he long persisted in governing without any Parliament at all. For
 to seven years he carried out with a blind recklessness his theory of
 1621

an absolute rule, unfettered by any scruples as to the past, or any dread of the future. All the abuses which Parliament after Parliament had denounced were not only continued, but developed in a spirit of defiance. The Ecclesiastical Commission was hounded on to a fresh persecution. James had admitted the illegality of Royal proclamations, but he issued them now in greater numbers than ever. The refusal of supplies was met by persistence in the levy of imposts; and, when this proved insufficient to meet the wants of the Treasury, by falling back on a resource, which even Wolsey in the height of the Tudor power had been forced to abandon. But the letters from the Royal Council demanding benevolences or loans from every landowner remained generally unanswered. In the three years which followed the dissolution of 1614 the strenuous efforts of the Sheriffs only raised sixty thousand pounds, a sum less than two-thirds of the value of a single subsidy; and although the remonstrances of the western counties were roughly silenced by the threats of the Council, two counties, those of Hereford and Stafford, sent not a penny to the last. In his distress for money James was driven to expedients which widened the breach between the gentry and the Crown. He had refused to part with the feudal privileges which had come down to him from the Middle Ages, such as his right to the wardship of young heirs and the marriage of heiresses, and these were now recklessly used as a means of fiscal extortion. He degraded the nobility by a shameless sale of peerages. Of the ninety lay peers whom he left in the Upper House at his death, a large part had been created by sheer bargaining during his reign. By shifts such as these James put off from day to day the necessity for again encountering the one body which could permanently arrest his effort after despotic rule. But there still remained a body whose tradition was strong enough, not indeed to arrest, but to check it. The lawyers had been subservient beyond all other classes to the Crown. In the narrow pedantry with which they bent before precedents, without admitting any distinction between precedents drawn from a time of freedom and precedents drawn from the worst times of tyranny, the Judges had supported James in his claims to impose Customs duties, and even to levy benevolences. But beyond precedents even the Judges refused to go. They had done their best, when the case came before them, to restrict the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts within legal and definite bounds: and when James asserted an inherent right in the King to be consulted as to the decision, whenever any case affecting the prerogative came before his courts, they timidly, but firmly, repudiated such a right as unknown to the law. James sent for them to the Royal closet, and rated them like schoolboys, till they fell on their knees, and, with a single exception, pledged themselves to obey his will. The Chief-Justice, Sir Edward Coke, a narrow-minded and bitter-tempered man, but of the highest minence as a lawyer, and with a reverence for the law that overrode every other instinct, alone remained firm. When any case

1304
to
1623

1604
to
1623

came before him, he answered, he would act as it became a judge to act. The provision which then made the judicial office tenable at the King's pleasure, but which had long been forgotten, was revived to humble the law in the person of its chief officer; and Coke, who had at once been dismissed from the Council, was on the continuance of his resistance deprived of his post of Chief-Justice. No act of James seems to have stirred a deeper horror and resentment among Englishmen than this announcement of his will to tamper with the course of justice. It was an outrage on the growing sense of law, as the profusion and profligacy of the Court were an outrage on the growing sense of morality. The Treasury was drained to furnish masques and revels on a scale of unexampled splendour. Lands and jewels were lavished on young adventurers, whose fair faces caught the Royal fancy. The Court of Elizabeth had been as immoral as that of her successor, but its immorality had been shrouded by a veil of grace and chivalry. But no veil hid the degrading grossness of the Court of James. The King was held, though unjustly, to be a drunkard, and suspected of vices compared with which drunkenness was almost a virtue. Actors in the royal masques were seen rolling intoxicated in open Court at the King's feet. A scandalous trial showed great nobles and officers of state in league with cheats and astrologers and poisoners. James himself meddled with justice to obtain a shameful divorce for Lady Essex, the most profligate woman of her time; and her subsequent bridal with one of his favourites was celebrated in his presence. Before scenes such as these, the half-idolatrous reverence with which the sovereign had been regarded throughout the period of the Tudors died away into abhorrence and contempt. The players openly mocked at the King on the stage. Mrs. Hutchinson denounces the orgies of Whitehall in words as fiery as those with which Elijah denounced the sensuality of Jezebel. But the immorality of James's Court was hardly more despicable than the imbecility of his government. In the silence of Parliament, the Royal Council, composed as it was not merely of the ministers, but of the higher nobles and great officers of state, had served even under a despot like Henry the Eighth as a check upon the purely arbitrary authority of the Crown. But after the death of Lord Burleigh's son, Robert Cecil, the minister whom Elizabeth had bequeathed to him, and whose services in procuring his accession were rewarded by the Earldom of Salisbury, all real control over affairs was withdrawn by James from the Council, and entrusted to worthless favourites whom the King chose to raise to honour. A Scotch page named Carr was created Earl of Rochester, married after her divorce to Lady Essex, and only hurled from favour and power by the discovery of a horrible crime, the murder of Sir Thomas Overbury by poison, of which he and his Countess were convicted of being the instigators. But the shame of one favourite only hurried James into the choice of another; and George Villiers, a handsome young adventurer, was raised rapidly through every rank of the peerage, made Marquis

and Duke of Buckingham, and entrusted with the direction of English policy. The payment of bribes to him, or marriage with his greedy relatives, soon became the only road to political preferment. Resistance to his will was inevitably followed by dismissal from office. Even the highest and most powerful of the nobility were made to tremble at the nod of this young upstart. "Never any man in any age, nor, I believe, in any country," says the astonished Clarendon, "rose in so short a time to so much greatness of honour, power, or fortune, upon no other advantage or recommendation than of the beauty or gracefulness of his person." But the selfishness and recklessness of Buckingham were equal to his beauty; and the haughty young favourite on whose neck James loved to loll, and whose cheek he slobbered with kisses, was destined to drag down in his fatal career the throne of the Stuarts.

1604
to
1623

The new system was even more disastrous in its results abroad than at home. The withdrawal of power from the Council left James in effect his own prime minister, and master of the control of affairs as no English sovereign had been before him. At his accession he found the direction of foreign affairs in the hands of Cecil, and so long as Cecil lived the Elizabethan policy was in the main adhered to. Peace, indeed, was made with Spain; but a close alliance with the United Provinces, and a close friendship with France, held the ambition of Spain as effectually in check as war. No sooner did signs of danger appear in Germany from the bigotry of the House of Austria, than the marriage of the King's daughter, Elizabeth, with the Elector-Palatine promised English support to its Protestant powers. It was, indeed, mainly to the firm direction of English policy during Cecil's ministry that the preservation of peace throughout Europe was due. But the death of Cecil, and the dissolution of the Parliament of 1614, were quickly followed by a disastrous change. James at once proceeded to undo all that the struggle of Elizabeth and the triumph of the Armada had done. He withdrew gradually from the close connexion with France. He began a series of negotiations for the marriage of his son with a Princess of Spain. Each of his successive favourites supported the Spanish alliance; and after years of secret intrigue the King's intentions were proclaimed to the world, at the moment when the religious truce which had so long preserved the peace of Germany was broken by the revolt of Bohemia against the Austrian archduke Ferdinand, who claimed its crown, and by its election of the Elector-Palatine to the vacant throne. From whatever quarter the first aggression had come, it was plain that a second great struggle in arms between Protestantism and Catholicism was now to be fought out on German soil. It was their prescience of the coming conflict, and of the pitiful part which James would play in it, which, on the very eve of the crisis, spurred the Protestant party among his ministers to support an enterprise which promised to detach the King from his new policy by entangling him in a war

The
Spanish
Policy

1617

1619

1604
to
1623

with Spain. Sir Walter Raleigh, the one great name of the Elizabethan time that still lingered on, had been imprisoned ever since the beginning of the new reign in the Tower on a charge of treason. He now offered to sail to the Orinoco, and discover a gold mine which he believed to exist on its banks. Guiana was Spanish ground; and the appeal to the King's cupidity was backed by the Protestant party with the purpose of bringing on, through Raleigh's settlement there, a contest with Spain. But though he yielded to the popular feeling in suffering Raleigh to sail, James had given previous warning of the voyage to his new ally; and the expedition had hardly landed, when it was driven back with loss from the coast. Raleigh's attempt to seize the Spanish treasure-ships on his return, with the same aim of provoking a war, was defeated by a mutiny among his crews; and the death of the broken-hearted adventurer on the scaffold atoned for the affront to Spain. But the failure of Raleigh's efforts to anticipate the crisis quickened the anxiety of the people at large when the crisis arrived. The German Protestants were divided by the fatal jealousy between their Lutheran and Calvinist princes; but it was believed that England could unite them, and it was on England's support that the Bohemians counted when they chose James's son-in-law for their king. A firm policy would at any rate have held Spain inactive, and limited the contest to Germany itself. But the "statecraft" on which James prided himself led him to count, not on Spanish fear, but on Spanish friendship. He refused aid to the Protestant union of the German Princes when they espoused the cause of Bohemia, and threatened war against Holland, the one power which was earnest in the Palatine's cause. It was in vain that both Court and people were unanimous in their cry for war; that Archbishop Abbot from his sick-bed implored the King to strike one blow for Protestantism; that Spain openly took part with the Catholic League, which had now been formed under the Duke of Bavaria, and marched an army upon the Rhine. James still pressed his son-in-law to withdraw from Bohemia, and counted on his influence with Spain to induce its armies to retire when once the Bohemian struggle was over. But a battle before the walls of Prague, which crushed the Bohemian revolt, drove Frederick back on the Rhine, to find the Spaniards encamped as its masters in the heart of the Palatinate. James had been duped, and for the moment he bent before the burst of popular fury which the danger to German Protestantism called up. A national subscription for the defence of the Palatinate enabled its Elector to raise an army; and his army was joined by a force of English volunteers under Sir Horace Vere. The cry for a Parliament, the necessary prelude to a war, overpowered the King's secret resistance, and the warlike speech with which he opened its session roused an enthusiasm which recalled the days of Elizabeth.

1620

The Commons answered the King's appeal by a unanimous vote—"lifting their hats as high as they could hold them"—that for

the recovery of the Palatinate they would adventure their fortunes, their estates, and their lives. "Rather this declaration," cried a leader of the Country party when it was read by the Speaker, "than ten thousand men already on the march!" But it met with no corresponding pledge or announcement of policy from James; on the contrary, he gave license for the export of arms to Spain. As yet constitutional grievances had been passed by, but the Royal defiance roused the Commons to revive a Parliamentary right which had slept ever since the reign of Henry the Sixth, the right of the Lower House to impeach great offenders at the bar of the Lords. The new weapon was put to a summary use. The most crying constitutional grievance sprang from the revival of monopolies, after the pledge of Elizabeth to suppress them; and the impeachment of a host of monopolists again put an end to his attempt to raise a revenue for the Crown without a grant from Parliament. But the blow at the corruption of the Court which followed was of a far more serious order. Not only was the Chancellor, Francis Bacon, Lord Verulam and Viscount St. Albans, the most distinguished man of his time for learning and ability, but his high position as an officer of the Crown made his impeachment for bribery a direct claim on the Parliament's part to supervise the Royal administration. James was too shrewd to mistake the importance of the step; but the hostility of Buckingham to the Chancellor, and Bacon's own confession of his guilt, made it difficult to resist his condemnation. Energetic too as its measures were, the Parliament respected scrupulously the King's prejudices in other matters; and even when checked by an adjournment, resolved unanimously to support him in any earnest effort for the Protestant cause. For the moment its resolve gave vigour to the Royal policy. James had aimed throughout at the restitution of Flanders to Ferdinand, and at inducing the Emperor, through the mediation of Spain, to abstain from any retaliation on the Palatinate. He now freed himself for a moment from the trammels of diplomacy, and enforced a cessation of the attack on his son-in-law's dominions by a threat of war. The suspension of arms lasted through the summer; but mere threats could do no more, and on the conquest of the Upper Palatinate at the close of the truce by the forces of the Catholic League, James suddenly returned to his old resolve to rely on negotiations, and on the friendly mediation of Spain. Gondomar, the Spanish ambassador, who had become powerful at the English Court, was assured that no effectual aid could be sent to the Palatinate. The English fleet, which was lying by way of menace off the Spanish coast, was called home. The King dismissed those of his ministers who still opposed a Spanish policy; and threatened on trivial pretexts a war with the Dutch, the one great Protestant power that remained in alliance with England, and was ready to back the Elector. But he had still to reckon with his Parliament; and the first act of the Parliament on its re-assembling was to demand a declaration of war with Spain.

1604
to
1623

The
Parliament of
1621

The instinct of the nation was wiser than the statecraft of the King. Ruined and enfeebled as she really was, Spain to the world at large still seemed the champion of Catholicism. It was the entry of her troops into the Palatinate which had first widened the local war in Bohemia into a great struggle for the suppression of Protestantism along the Rhine; above all it was Spanish influence, and the hopes held out of a marriage of his son with a Spanish Infanta, which were luring the King into his fatal dependence on the great enemy of the Protestant cause. In their petition the Houses coupled with their demands for war the demand of a Protestant marriage for their future King. Experience proved in later years how perilous it was for English freedom that the heir to the Crown should be brought up under a Catholic mother; but James was beside himself at their presumption in dealing with mysteries of State. "Bring stools for the Ambassadors," he cried in bitter irony as the committee of the Commons appeared before him. He refused the petition, forbade any further discussion of State policy, and threatened the speakers with the Tower. "Let us resort to our prayers," a member said calmly as the King's letter was read, "and then consider of this great business." The temper of the Commons was seen in the Protestation which met the Royal command to abstain from discussion. The House resolved "That the liberties, franchises, privileges, and jurisdictions of Parliament are the ancient and undoubted birthright and inheritance of the subjects of England; and that the arduous and urgent affairs concerning the King, State, and defence of the Realm, and of the Church of England, and the making and maintenance of laws, and redress of grievances, which daily happen within this Realm, are proper subjects and matter of Council and debate in Parliament. And that in the handling and proceeding of those businesses every member of the House hath, and of right ought to have, freedom of speech to propound, treat, reason, and bring to conclusion the same."

The King answered the Protestation by a characteristic outrage. He sent for the Journals of the House, and with his own hand tore out the pages which contained it. "I will govern," he said, "according to the common weal, but not according to the common will." A few days after he dissolved the Parliament. "It is the best thing that has happened in the interests of Spain and of the Catholic religion since Luther began preaching," wrote the Count of Gondomar to his master, in his joy that all danger of war had passed away. "I am ready to depart," Sir Henry Saville, on the other hand, murmured on his death-bed, "the rather that having lived in good times I foresee worse." Abroad indeed all was lost; and Germany plunged wildly and blindly forward into the chaos of the Thirty Years' War. But for England the victory of freedom was practically won. James had himself ruined the system of Elizabeth. In his desire for personal government he had destroyed the authority of the Council. He had accustomed men to think

lightly of the great ministers of the Crown, to see them browbeaten by favourites, and driven from office for corruption. He had disenchanted his people of their blind faith in the Crown by a policy at home and abroad which ran counter to every national instinct. He had quarrelled with, and insulted the Houses, as no English sovereign had ever done before; and all the while he was conscious that the authority he boasted of was passing, without his being able to hinder it, to the Parliament which he outraged. There was shrewdness as well as anger in his taunt at its "ambassadors." A power had at last risen up in the Commons with which the Monarchy was henceforth to reckon. In spite of the King's petulant outbreaks, Parliament had asserted and enforced its exclusive right to the control of taxation. It had suppressed monopolies. It had reformed abuses in the courts of law. It had revived the right of impeaching and removing from office even the highest ministers of the Crown. It had asserted its privilege of free discussion on all questions connected with the welfare of the realm. It had claimed to deal with the question of religion. It had even declared its will on the sacred "mystery" of foreign policy. James might tear the Protestation from its Journals, but there were pages in the record of the Parliament of 1621 which he never could tear out.

1604
to
1623

SECTION III.—THE KING AND THE PARLIAMENT, 1623—1629

[*Authorities.*—To those already mentioned may be added Bulstrode Whitelocke, "Memorials of English Affairs," and Rushworth, "Historical Collections." For constitutional documents, see Gardiner, "Documents of the Puritan Revolution." For individuals, see the character sketches in Clarendon's "History of the Great Rebellion," and their lives in the "Dictionary of National Biography." For the general religious history of the period, see the volume by Gardiner in Hunt and Stephens, "History of the English Church."]

In the obstinacy with which he clung to his Spanish policy James stood absolutely alone; for not only the old nobility and the statesmen who preserved the tradition of the age of Elizabeth, but even his own ministers, with the exception of Buckingham, were at one with the Commons. The King's aim, as we have said, was to enforce peace on the combatants, and to bring about the restitution of the Palatinate to the Elector, through the influence of Spain. It was as to secure this influence that he pressed for a closer union with the great Catholic power; and of this union, and the success of the policy which it embodied, the marriage of his son Charles with the Infanta, which had been held out as a lure to his vanity, was to be the sign. The more, however, James pressed for this consummation of his projects, the more Spain held back; but so bent was the King on its realization that, after fruitless negotiations, the Prince hid himself in disguise, and appeared with Buckingham at Madrid to claim his promised bride. It was in vain that the

The
Spanish
Marriage

1623 Spanish Court rose in its demands; for every new demand was
 to met by fresh concessions on the part of England. The abrogation
 1629 of the penal laws against the Catholics, a Catholic education for
 — the Prince's children, a Catholic household for the Infanta, all were
 1623 no sooner asked than they were granted. But the marriage was
 still delayed, while the influence of the new policy on the war in
 Germany was hard to see. The Catholic League, and its army under
 the command of Count Tilly, won triumph after triumph over their
 divided foes. The reduction of Heidelberg and Mannheim com-
 pleted the conquest of the Palatinate, whose Elector fled helplessly
 to Holland, while his Electoral dignity was transferred by the
 Emperor to the Duke of Bavaria. But there was still no sign of
 the hoped-for intervention on the part of Spain. At last the
 pressure of Charles himself brought about the disclosure of the
 secret of its policy. "It is a maxim of state with us," the Duke
 of Olivarez confessed, as the Prince demanded an energetic inter-
 ference in Germany, "that the King of Spain must never fight
 against the Emperor. We cannot employ our forces against the
 Emperor." "If you hold to that," replied the Prince, "there is
 an end of all."

Charles His return was the signal for a burst of national joy. All London
 the was alight with bonfires, in her joy at the failure of the Spanish
 first match, and of the collapse, humiliating as it was, of the policy
 which had so long trailed English honour at the chariot-wheels of
 Spain. Charles returned with the fixed resolve to take the direction
 of affairs out of his father's hands. The journey to Madrid had
 revealed to those around him the strange mixture of obstinacy and
 weakness in the Prince's character, the duplicity which lavished
 promises because it never purposed to be bound by any, the potty
 pride that subordinated every political consideration to personal
 vanity or personal pique. He had granted demand after demand,
 till the very Spaniards lost faith in his concessions. With rage in
 his heart at the failure of his efforts, he had renewed his betrothal
 on the very eve of his departure, only that he might insult the
 Infanta by its withdrawal when he was safe at home. But to
 England at large the baser features of his character were still
 unknown. The stately reserve, the personal dignity and decency
 of manners which distinguished the Prince, contrasted favourably
 with the gabble and indecorum of his father. The courtiers indeed
 who saw him in his youth, would often pray God that "he might
 be in the right way when he set; for if he was in the wrong he
 would prove the most wilful of any king that ever reigned." But
 the nation was willing to take his obstinacy for firmness; as it
 took the pique which inspired his course on his return for patriotism
 and for the promise of a nobler rule. His first acts were energetic
 enough. The King was forced to summon a Parliament, and to
 concede the point on which he had broken with the last, by laying
 before it the whole question of the Spanish negotiations. Bucking-
 1624 ham and the Prince personally joined the Parliament in its demand

or a rupture of the treaties and a declaration of war. A subsidy was eagerly voted; the persecution of the Catholics, which had long been suspended out of deference to Spanish intervention, recommenced with vigour. The head of the Spanish party in the ministry, Cranfield, Earl of Middlesex, the Lord Treasurer, was impeached on a charge of corruption, and dismissed from office. James was swept along helplessly by the tide; but, helpless as he was, his shrewdness saw clearly enough the turn that things were really taking. "You are making a rod for your own back," he said to Buckingham, when his favourite pressed him to consent to Cranfield's disgrace. But Charles and Buckingham were still absolute in their project of war. The Spanish ambassador quitted the realm; a treaty of alliance was concluded with Holland; negotiations were begun with the Lutheran Princes of North Germany, who had looked coolly on at the ruin of the Calvinistic Elector-Palatine; and the marriage of Charles with Henrietta, a daughter of Henry the Fourth of France, and sister of its King, promised a renewal of the system of Elizabeth. At this juncture the death of the old King placed Charles upon the throne; and his first Parliament met him in a passion of loyalty. "We can hope everything from the King who now governs us," cried Sir Benjamin Rudyard in the Commons. But there were cooler heads in the Commons than Sir Benjamin Rudyard's; and, loyal as the Parliament was, enough had taken place in the short interval between the accession of the new monarch and its assembling to temper its loyalty with caution.

The war with Spain, it must be remembered, meant to common Englishmen a war with Catholicism; and the fervour against Popery without roused a corresponding fervour against Popery within the realm. Every Papist seemed to Protestant eyes an enemy at home. A Churchman who leaned to Popery was a traitor to the ranks. The temper of the Commons on these points was clear to every observer. "Whatever mention does break forth of the fears or dangers in religion, and the increase of Popery," wrote a member who was noting the proceedings of the House, "their actions are much stirred." But Charles had already renewed the persecution of the Catholics, and warned the House to leave priest and recusant to the discretion of the Crown. It was soon plain that ecclesiastical policy would be even more hostile to the Puritans than that of his father had been. Bishop Laud was put practically the head of ecclesiastical affairs, and Laud had at once drawn a list of ministers divided ominously into "orthodox" and "Puritan." The most notorious among the High Church divines, Doctor Montagu, advocated in his sermons the Divine right of kings and the Real Presence, besides slighting the Protestant reches of the Continent in favour of the Church of Rome. The next act of the Commons was to summon Montagu to their bar, and to commit him to prison. But there were other grounds for their distrust besides the King's ecclesiastical tendency. The

1623
to
1629

1625

1623
to
1629

subsidy of the last Parliament had been wasted, yet Charles still refused to declare with what power England was at war, or to avow that the great fleet he was manning was destined to act against Spain. The real part which he had played in the marriage negotiations had gradually been revealed, and the discovery had destroyed all faith in his Protestant enthusiasm. His reserve therefore was met by a corresponding caution. While voting a subsidy, the Commons restricted their grant of certain Customs duties, which had commonly been granted to the new sovereign for life, to a single year. The restriction was taken as an insult; Charles refused to accept the grant, and Buckingham resolved to break with the Parliament at any cost. He suddenly demanded a new subsidy, a demand made merely to be denied, and which died without debate. But the denial increased the King's irritation, and he marked it by drawing Montagu from the prison, by promoting him to a Royal chaplaincy, and by levying his disputed customs on his own authority. The Houses met at Oxford in a sterner temper. "England," cried Sir Robert Philips, "is the last monarchy that yet retains her liberties. Let them not perish now!" But the Commons had no sooner announced their resolve to consider public grievances before entering on other business than they were met by a dissolution. Buckingham, who was more powerful with Charles than he had been with his father, had resolved to lure England from her constitutional struggle by a great military triumph; and staking everything on success, he sailed for the Hague to conclude a general alliance against the House of Austria, while a fleet of ninety vessels and ten thousand soldiers left Plymouth for the coast of Spain. But if the projects of Charles were bolder than those of his predecessor, his execution of them was just as incapable. The alliance broke utterly down. After an idle descent on Cadiz the Spanish expedition returned, broken with mutiny and disease. The enormous debt which had been incurred in its equipment forced the favourite to advise a new summons of the Houses; but he was keenly alive to the peril in which his failure had plunged him, and to a coalition which had been formed between his rivals at Court and the leaders of the last Parliament. His reckless daring led him to anticipate the danger, and by a series of blows to strike terror into his opponents. Lord Pembroke was forced to a humiliating submission; Lord Arundel was sent to the Tower. Sir Richard Philips, Coke, and four other leading patriots were made Sheriffs of their counties, and thus prevented from sitting in the coming Parliament. But their exclusion only left the field free for a more terrible foe.

Eliot If Hampden and Pym are the great figures which embody the later national resistance, the earlier struggle for Parliamentary liberty centres in the figure of Sir John Eliot. Of an old family—ennobled since his time—which had settled under Elizabeth near the fishing hamlet of St. Germain's, and whose stately mansion gives its name of Port Eliot to a little town on the Tamar, he had risen

to the post of Vice-Admiral of Devonshire under the patronage of Buckingham, and had seen his activity in the suppression of piracy in the Channel rewarded by an unjust imprisonment. He was now in the first vigour of manhood, with a mind exquisitely cultivated and familiar with the poetry and learning of his day, a nature singularly lofty and devout, a fearless and vehement temper. There was a hot impulsive element in his nature which showed itself in youth in his drawing sword on a neighbour who denounced him to his father, and which in later years gave its characteristic fire to his eloquence. But his intellect was as clear and cool as his temper was ardent. In the general enthusiasm which followed on the failure of the Spanish Marriage, he had stood almost alone in pressing for a recognition of the rights of Parliament, as a preliminary to any real reconciliation with the Crown. He fixed, from the very outset of his career, on the responsibility of the royal ministers to Parliament, as the one critical point for English liberty. It was to enforce the demand of this that he availed himself of Buckingham's sacrifice of the Treasurer, Cranfield, to the resentment of the Commons. "The greater the delinquent," he urged, "the greater the delict. They are a happy thing, great men and officers, if they be good, and one of the greatest blessings of the land: but power converted into evil is the greatest curse that can befall it." But the new Parliament had hardly met, when he came to the front to threaten a greater criminal than Cranfield. So menacing were his words, as he called for an inquiry into the failure before Cadiz, that Charles himself stooped to answer threat with threat. "I see," he wrote to the House, "you especially aim at the Duke of Buckingham. I must let you know that I will not allow any of my servants to be questioned among you, much less such as are of eminent place and near to me." A more direct attack was a right already acknowledged in the impeachment of Bacon and Cranfield could hardly be imagined, but Eliot refused to move on his constitutional ground. The King was by law irresponsible, "could do no wrong." If the country therefore was to be saved from a pure despotism, it must be by enforcing the responsibility on the ministers who counselled and executed his acts. Eliot persisted in denouncing Buckingham's incompetence and corruption, and the Commons ordered the subsidy which the Crown had demanded to be brought in "when we shall have presented our remonstrances, and received his Majesty's answer thereto." Charles summoned them to Whitehall, and commanded them to cancel the condition. He would grant them "liberty of counsel, but not control;" and he closed the interview with a significant threat. "Remember," he said, "that Parliaments are altogether in my power for their calling, sitting, and dissolution: and therefore, as kind the fruits of them to be good or evil, they are to continue or not to be." But the will of the Commons was as resolute as the will of the King. Buckingham's impeachment was voted and referred to the Lords. The favourite took his seat as a peer to listen

1623
to
1629

1626

1623
to
1629

to the charge with so insolent an air of contempt that one of the managers appointed by the Commons to conduct it turned sharply on him. "Do you jeer, my Lord!" said Sir Dudley Digges. "I can show you when a greater man than your Lordship—as high as you in place and power, and as deep in the King's favour—has been hanged for as small a crime as these articles contain." The "proud carriage" of the Duke provoked an invective from Eliot which marks a new era in Parliamentary speech. From the first the vehemence and passion of his words had contrasted with the grave, colourless reasoning of older speakers. His opponents complained that Eliot aimed to "stir up affections." The quick emphatic sentences he substituted for the cumbrous periods of the day, his rapid argument, his vivacious and caustic allusions, his passionate appeals, his fearless invective, struck a new note in English eloquence. The frivolous ostentation of Buckingham, his very figure blazing with jewels and gold, gave point to the fierce attack. "He has broken those nerves and sinews of our land, the stores and treasures of the King. There needs no search for it. It is too visible. His profuse expenses, his superfluous feasts, his magnificent buildings, his riots, his excesses, what are they but the visible evidences of an express exhausting of the State, a chronicle of the immensity of his waste of the revenues of the Crown?" With the same terrible directness Eliot reviewed the Duke's greed and corruption, his insatiate ambition, his seizure of all public authority, his neglect of every public duty, his abuse for selfish ends of the powers he had accumulated. "The pleasure of his Majesty, his known directions, his public acts, his acts of council, the decrees of courts—all must be made inferior to this man's will. No right, no interest may withstand him. Through the power of state and justice he has dared ever to strike at his own ends." "My Lords," he ended, after a vivid parallel between Buckingham and Sejanus, "you see the man! What have been his actions, what he is like, you know! I leave him to your judgment. Thus only is conceived by us, the knights, citizens, and burgesses of the Commons House of Parliament, that by him came all our evils, in him we find the causes, and on him must be the remedies! *Pereat qui perdere cuncta festinat. Opprimatur ne omnes opprimat!*"

The
King
and the
People

The reply of Charles was as fierce and sudden as the attack of Eliot. He hurried to the House of Peers to avow as his own the deeds with which Buckingham was charged. Eliot and Digges were called from their seats, and committed prisoners to the Tower. The Commons, however, refused to proceed with public business till their members were restored; and after a ten days' struggle Eliot was released. But his release was only a prelude to the close of the Parliament. "Not one moment," the King replied to the prayer of his Council for delay; and the final remonstrance in which the Commons begged him to dismiss Buckingham from his service for ever was met by their instant dissolution. The remonstrance was burnt by Royal order, Eliot was deprived of his Vice-Admiralty

and the subsidies which the Parliament had refused to grant till their grievances were redressed were levied in the arbitrary form of benevolences. But the tide of public resistance was slowly rising. Refusals to give anything, "save by way of Parliament," came in from county after county. The arguments of the judges, who summoned the subsidy-men of Middlesex and Westminster to persuade them to comply, were met by the crowd with a tumultuous shout of "a Parliament! a Parliament! else no subsidies!" Kent stood out to a man. In Bucks the very justices neglected to ask for the "free gift." The freeholders of Cornwall only answered that, "if they had but two kine, they would sell one of them for supply to his Majesty—in a Parliamentary way." The failure of the voluntary benevolence was met by the levy of forced loan. Commissioners were named to assess the amount which every landowner was bound to lend, and to examine on oath all who refused. Every means of persuasion, as of force, was resorted to. The High Church pulpits resounded with the cry of passive obedience." Dr. Mainwaring preached before Charles himself, that the King needed no Parliamentary warrant for taxation, and that to resist his will was to incur eternal damnation. Soldiers were quartered on recalcitrant boroughs. Poor men who refused to lend were pressed into the army or navy. Stubborn tradesmen were flung into prison. Buckingham himself undertook the task of overawing the nobles and the gentry. Among the shops, the Primate and Bishop Williams of Lincoln alone resisted the King's will. The first was suspended on a frivolous pretext, and the second was disgraced. But in the country at large resistance was universal. The northern counties in a mass set the Crown defiance. The Lincolnshire farmers drove the Commissioners from the town. Shropshire, Devon, and Warwickshire "refused utterly." Eight peers, with Lord Essex and Lord Warwick at their head, declined to comply with the exaction as illegal. Two hundred country gentlemen, whose obstinacy had not been subdued by their transfer from prison to prison, were summoned before the council. John Hampden, as yet only a young Buckinghamshire squire, appeared at the board to begin that career of patriotism which has made his name dear to Englishmen. "I could be content to lend," he said, "but fear to draw on myself that curse in Magna Charta, which should be read twice a year against those who ring it." So close an imprisonment in the Gate House rewarded protest, "that he never afterwards did look like the same man he was before." With gathering discontent as well as bankruptcy before him, nothing could save the Duke but a great military success; and he equipped a force of seven thousand men for the maddest and most profligate of all his enterprises. In the great struggle with Catholicism the hopes of every Protestant rested on the union of England with France against the House of Austria. Some causes never fully explained, but in which a personal pique against the French minister, Cardinal Richelieu, mingled with the

1623
to
1629

1627

1623 desire to win an easy popularity at home by supporting the French
 1629 Huguenots, Buckingham at this juncture broke suddenly with France, sailed in person to the Isle of Rhé, and roused the great Huguenot city of Rochelle to revolt. The expedition was as disastrous as it was impolitic. After a useless siege of the castle of St. Martin, the English troops were forced to fall back along a narrow causeway to their ships; and in the retreat two thousand fell, without the loss of a single man to their enemies.

The
 Petition
 of Right

The first result of Buckingham's folly was the fall of Rochelle and the ruin of the Huguenot cause in France. Indirectly, as we have seen, it helped on the ruin of the cause of Protestantism in Germany. But in England it forced on Charles, overwhelmed as he was with debt and shame, the summoning of a new Parliament; a Parliament which met in a mood even more resolute than the last. The Court candidates were everywhere rejected. The patriot leaders were triumphantly returned. To have suffered in the recent resistance to arbitrary taxation was the sure road to a seat. In spite of Eliot's counsel, all other grievances, even that of Buckingham himself, gave place to the craving for redress of wrongs done to personal liberty. "We must vindicate our ancient liberties," said Sir Thomas Wentworth, in words soon to be remembered against himself: "we must reinforce the laws made by our ancestors. We must set such a stamp upon them, as no licentious spirit shall dare hereafter to invade them." Heedless of sharp and menacing messages from the King, of demands that they should take his "Royal word" for their liberties, the House bent itself to one great work, the drawing up a Petition of Right. The statutes that protected the subject against arbitrary taxation, against loans and benevolences, against punishment, outlawry, or deprivation of goods, otherwise than by lawful judgment of his peers, against arbitrary imprisonment without stated charge, against billeting of soldiery on the people or enactment of martial law in time of peace, were formally recited. The breaches of them under the last two sovereigns, and above all since the dissolution of the last Parliament, were recited as formally. At the close of this significant list, the Commons prayed "that no man hereafter be compelled to make or yield any gift, loan, benevolence, tax, or such like charge, without common consent by Act of Parliament. And that none be called to make answer, or to take such oaths, or to be confined or otherwise molested or disputed concerning the same, or for refusal thereof. And that no freeman may in such manner as is before mentioned be imprisoned or detained. And that your Majesty would be pleased to remove the said soldiers and mariners, and that your people may not be so burthened in time to come. And that the commissions for proceeding by martial law may be revoked and annulled, and that hereafter no commissions of like nature may issue forth to any person or persons whatsoever to be executed as aforesaid, lest by colour of them any of your Majesty's subjects be destroyed and put to death, contrary to the laws and

1628

franchises of the land. All which they humbly pray of your most excellent Majesty, as their rights and liberties, according to the laws and statutes of the realm. And that your Majesty would also vouchsafe to declare that the awards, doings, and proceedings to the prejudice of your people in any of the premises shall not be drawn hereafter into consequence or example. And that your Majesty would be pleased graciously for the further comfort and safety of your people to declare your Royal will and pleasure, that in the things aforesaid all your officers and ministers shall serve you according to the laws and statutes of this realm, as they tender the honour of your Majesty and the prosperity of the kingdom." It was in vain that the Lords desired to conciliate Charles by a reservation of his "sovereign power." "Our petition," Pym quietly replied, "is for the laws of England, and this power seems to be another power distinct from the power of the law." The Lords yielded, but Charles gave an evasive reply; and the failure of the more moderate counsels for which his own had been set aside, called Eliot again to the front. In a speech of unprecedented boldness he moved the presentation to the King of a Remonstrance on the state of the realm. But at the moment when he again touched on Buckingham's removal as the preliminary of any real improvement the Speaker of the House interposed. "There was a command laid on him," he said, "to interrupt any that should go about to lay an aspersion on the King's ministers." The breach of their privilege of free speech produced a scene in the Commons such as St. Stephen's had never witnessed before. Eliot sate abruptly down amidst the solemn silence of the House. "Then appeared such a spectacle of passions," says a letter of the time, "as the like had seldom been seen in such an assembly: some weeping, some expostulating, some prophesying of the fatal ruin of our kingdom, some playing the divines in confessing their sins and country's sins which drew these judgments upon us, some ending, as it were, fault with those that wept. There were above an hundred weeping eyes, many who offered to speak being interrupted and silenced by their own passions." Pym himself rose only to sit down choked with tears. At last Sir Edward Coke found words to blame himself for the timid counsels which had checked Eliot at the beginning of the Session, and to protest "that the author and source of all those miseries was the Duke of Buckingham."

Shouts of assent greeted the resolution to insert the Duke's name in their Remonstrance. But the danger to his favourite overcame the King's obstinacy, and to avert it he suddenly offered to consent to the Petition of Right. His consent won a grant of subsidy from the Parliament, and such a ringing of bells and lighting of bonfires on the people "as were never seen but upon his Majesty's return from Spain." But, like all Charles's concessions, it came too late to effect the end at which he aimed. The Commons persisted in presenting their Remonstrance. Charles received it coldly and ungraciously; while Buckingham, who had stood defiantly at his

1623
to
1629

The
Death of
Buckingham

1623
1629

master's side as he was denounced, fell on his knees to speak. "No, George!" said the King as he raised him; and his demeanour gave emphatic proof that the Duke's favour remained undiminished. "We will perish together, George," he added at a later time, "if thou dost." No shadow of his doom, in fact, had fallen over the brilliant favourite, when, after the prorogation of the Parliament, he set out to take command of a new expedition for the relief of Rochelle. But a lieutenant in the army, John Felton, soured by neglect and wrongs, had found in the Remonstrance some fancied sanction for the revenge he plotted, and, mixing with the throng which crowded the hall at Portsmouth, he stabbed Buckingham to the heart. Charles flung himself on his bed in a passion of tears when the news reached him; but outside the Court it was welcomed with a burst of joy. Young Oxford bachelors, grave London aldermen, vied with each other in drinking healths to Felton. "God bless thee, little David," cried an old woman, as the murderer passed manacled by; "the Lord comfort thee," shouted the crowd, as the Tower gates closed on him. The very crews of the Duke's armament at Portsmouth shouted to the King, as he witnessed their departure, a prayer that he would "spare John Felton, their sometime fellow soldier." But whatever national hopes the fall of Buckingham had aroused were quickly dispelled. Weston, a creature of the Duke, became Lord Treasurer, and his system remained unchanged. "Though our Achan is cut off," said Eliot, "the accursed thing remains."

The
Quarrel
of
Religion

It seemed as if no act of Charles could widen the breach which his reckless lawlessness had made between himself and his subjects. But there was one thing dearer to England than free speech in Parliament, than security for property, or even personal liberty; and that one thing was, in the phrase of the day, "the Gospel." The gloom which at the outset of this reign we saw settling down on every Puritan heart had deepened with each succeeding year. The great struggle abroad had gone more and more against Protestantism, and at this moment the end of the cause seemed to have come. In Germany Lutheran and Calvinist alike lay at last beneath the heel of the Catholic House of Austria. The fall of Rochelle left the Huguenots of France at the feet of a Roman Cardinal. While England was thrilling with excitement at the thought that her own hour of deadly peril might come again, as it had come in the year of the Armada, Charles raised Laud to the Bishopric of London, and entrusted him with the direction of ecclesiastical affairs. To the excited Protestantism of the country, Laud, and the High Churchmen whom he headed, seemed a danger more really formidable than the Popery which was making such mighty strides abroad. They were traitors at home, traitors to God and their country at once. Their aim was to draw the Church of England farther away from the Protestant Churches, and nearer to the Church which Protestants regarded as Babylon. They aped Roman ceremonies. Cautiously and tentatively they were intro-

ducing Roman doctrine. But they had none of the sacerdotal independence which Rome had at any rate preserved. They were abject in their dependence on the Crown. Their gratitude for the Royal protection which enabled them to defy the religious instincts of the realm showed itself in their erection of the most dangerous pretensions of the monarchy into religious dogmas. Their model, Bishop Andrewes, declared James to have been inspired by God. They preached passive obedience to the worst tyranny. They declared the person and goods of the subject to be at the King's absolute disposal. They turned religion into a systematic attack on English liberty. Up to this time, however, they had been little more than a knot of courtly parsons—for the mass of the clergy, like their flocks, were steady Puritans—but the well-known energy of Laud promised a speedy increase of their numbers and their power. Sober men looked forward to a day when every pulpit would be ringing with exhortations to passive obedience, with denunciations of Calvinism and apologies for Rome. Of all the members of the House of Commons Eliot was least fanatical in his natural bent, but the religious crisis swept away for the moment all other thoughts from his mind. "Danger enlarges itself in so great a measure," he wrote from the country, "that nothing but Heaven shrouds us from despair." The House met in the same temper. The first business it called up was that of religion. "The Gospel," Eliot burst forth, "is that Truth in which this kingdom has been happy through a long and rare prosperity. This ground, therefore, let us lay for a foundation of our building, that that Truth, not with words, but with actions we will maintain!" "There is a ceremony," he went on, "used in the Eastern Churches, of standing at the repetition of the Creed, to testify their purpose to maintain it, not only with their bodies upright, but with their words drawn. Give me leave to call that a custom very commendable!" The Commons answered their leader's challenge by a solemn vow. They avowed that they held for truth that sense of the Articles as established by Parliament, which by the public act of the Church, and the general and current exposition of the writers of their Church, had been delivered unto them. But the debates over religion were suddenly interrupted. The Commons, who had deferred all grant of customs till the wrong done in the legal levy of them was redressed, had summoned the farmers of those dues to the bar; but though they appeared, they pleaded the King's command as a ground for their refusal to answer. The House was proceeding to a protest, when the Speaker signified that he had received a Royal order to adjourn. Dissolution was clearly at hand, and the long-suppressed indignation broke out in a scene of strange disorder. The Speaker was held down in the chair, while Eliot, still clinging to his great principle of ministerial responsibility, denounced the new Treasurer as the adviser of the measure. "None have gone about to break Parliaments," he added in words to which after events gave a terrible significance, "but in the end

1623
to
1629

1629

Parliaments have broken them." The doors were locked, and in spite of the Speaker's protests, of the repeated knocking of the usher sent by Charles to summon the Commons to his presence in the Lords' chamber, and of the gathering tumult within the House itself, the loud "Aye, Aye" of the bulk of the members supported Eliot in his last vindication of English liberty. By successive resolutions the Commons declared whosoever should bring in innovations in religion, or whatever minister advised the levy of subsidies not granted in Parliament, "a capital enemy to the Kingdom and Commonwealth," and every subject voluntarily complying with illegal acts and demands "a betrayer of the liberty of England, and an enemy of the same."

SECTION IV.—NEW ENGLAND

[*Authorities.*—Documents are calendared in the Colonial Calendar. The best account of the English settlements during the period is Doyle, "History of the English in America." For Laud, see his Diary; Heylyn's "Life of Laud"; and Prynne, "Canterbury's Doom.")

England
and the
New
World

The dissolution of the Parliament of 1629 marked the darkest hour of Protestantism, whether in England or in the world at large. But it was in this hour of despair that the Puritans won their noblest triumph. They "turned," to use Canning's words in a far truer and grander sense than that which he gave to them, they "turned to the New World to redress the balance of the Old." It was during the years of tyranny which followed the close of the third Parliament of Charles that the great Puritan emigration founded the States of New England.

The Puritans were far from being the earliest among the English colonists of North America. There was little in the circumstances which attended the first discovery of the Western world which promised well for freedom; its earliest result, indeed, was to give an enormous impulse to the most bigoted and tyrannical of the Continental powers, and to pour the wealth of Mexico and Peru into the treasury of Spain. But while the Spanish galleons traversed the Southern sea, and Spanish settlers claimed the southern part of the great continent for the Catholic crown, the truer instinct of Englishmen drew them to the ruder and more barren districts along the shore of Northern America. Long before the time of Columbus the fisheries of the North Sea had made the merchants of Bristol familiar with the coasts of Greenland; and two years before the great navigator reached the actual mainland of America, a Venetian merchant, John Cabot, who dwelt at Bristol, had landed with a crew of English sailors among the icy solitudes of Labrador. A year later his son, Sebastian Cabot, sailing from the same English port to the same point on the American coast, pushed south as far as Maryland, and north as high as Hudson's Bay. For a long time, however, no one followed in the track of these bold

adventurers. While France settled its Canadian colonists along the St. Lawrence, and Spain—already mistress of the South—extended its dominions as far northwards as Florida, the attention of Englishmen limited itself to the fisheries of Newfoundland. It was only in the reign of Elizabeth that men's thoughts turned again to the discoveries of Cabot. Frobisher, in a vessel no bigger than a man-of-war's barge, made his way to the coast of Labrador; and the false news which he brought back of the existence of gold mines there drew adventurer after adventurer among the icebergs of Hudson's Straits. Luckily the quest of gold proved a vain one; and the nobler spirits among those who had engaged in it turned to plans of colonization. But the country, vexed by long winters, and thinly peopled by warlike tribes of Indians, gave a rough welcome to the earlier colonists. After a fruitless attempt to form a settlement, Sir Humphry Gilbert, one of the noblest spirits of his time, turned homewards again, to find his fate in the stormy seas. "We are as near to Heaven by sea as by land," were the famous words he was heard to utter, ere the light of his little bark was lost for ever in the darkness of the night. An expedition sent by his brother-in-law, Sir Walter Raleigh, explored Pamlico Sound; and the country they discovered, a country where, in their poetic fancy, "men lived after the manner of the Golden Age," received from Elizabeth, the Virgin Queen, the name of Virginia. The introduction of tobacco and of the potato into Europe dates from Raleigh's discovery; but the energy of his settlers was distracted by the delusive dream of gold, the hostility of the native tribes drove them from the coast, and it is through the gratitude of later times for what he strove to do, rather than for what he did, that Raleigh, the capital of North Carolina, preserves his name. The first permanent settlement on the Chesapeake was effected in the beginning of the reign of James the First, and its success was due to the conviction of the settlers that the secret of the New World's conquest lay simply in labour. Among the hundred and five colonists who originally landed, forty-eight were gentlemen, and only twelve were tillers of the soil. Their leader, John Smith, however, not only explored the vast bay of Chesapeake and discovered the Potomac and the Susquehannah, but held the little company together in the face of famine and desertion till the colonists had learnt the lesson of toil. In his letters to the colonizers at home he set resolutely aside the dream of gold. "Nothing is to be expected thence," he wrote of the new country, "but by labour;" and supplies of labourers, aided by a wise allotment of lands to each colonist, secured after five years of struggle the fortunes of Virginia. "Men fell to building houses and planting corn;" the very streets of Jamestown, as their capital was called from the reigning sovereign, were sown with tobacco; and in fifteen years the colony numbered five thousand souls.

The laws and representative institutions of England were first introduced into the New World in the settlement of Virginia:

1576

1584

1606

The
"Pilgrim
Fathers"


1634

1620

some years later a principle as unknown to England as it was to the greater part of Europe found its home in another colony, which received its name of Maryland from Henrietta Maria, the queen of Charles the First. Calvert, Lord Baltimore, one of the best of the Stuart counsellors, was forced by his conversion to Catholicism to seek a shelter for himself and colonists of his new faith in the district across the Potomac, and round the head of the Chesapeake. As a purely Catholic settlement was impossible, he resolved to open the new colony to men of every faith. "No person within this province," ran the earliest law of Maryland, "professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall be in any ways troubled, molested, or discountenanced for his or her religion, or in the free exercise thereof." Long however before Lord Baltimore's settlement in Maryland, only a few years indeed after the settlement of Smith in Virginia, the little church of Brownist or Independent refugees, whom we saw driven in Elizabeth's reign to Amsterdam, had resolved to quit Holland and find a home in the wilds of the New World. They were little disheartened by the tidings of suffering which came from the Virginian settlement. "We are well weaned," wrote their minister, John Robinson, "from the delicate milk of the mother-country, and inured to the difficulties of a strange land: the people are industrious and frugal. We are knit together as a body in a most sacred covenant of the Lord, of the violation whereof we make great conscience, and by virtue whereof we hold ourselves strictly tied to all care of each other's good and of the whole. It is not with us as with men whom small things can discourage." Returning from Holland to Southampton, they started in two small vessels for the new land: but one of these soon put back, and only its companion, the *Mayflower*, a bark of a hundred and eighty tons, with forty-one emigrants and their families on board, persisted in prosecuting its voyage. The little company of the "Pilgrim Fathers," as after-times loved to call them, landed on the barren coast of Massachusetts at a spot to which they gave the name of Plymouth, in memory of the last English port at which they touched. They had soon to face the long hard winter of the north, to bear sickness and famine: even when these years of toil and suffering had passed there was a time when "they knew not at night where to have a bit in the morning." Resolute and industrious as they were, their progress was very slow; and at the end of ten years they numbered only three hundred souls. But small as it was, the colony was now firmly established and the struggle for mere existence was over. "Let it not be grievous unto you," some of their brethren had written from England to the poor emigrants in the midst of their sufferings, "that you have been instrumental to break the ice for others. The honour shall be yours to the world's end."

The
Puritan
Emi-
gration

From the moment of their establishment the eyes of the English Puritans were fixed on the little Puritan settlement in North America. The sanction of the Crown was necessary to raise it into



1629

a colony; and the aid which the merchants of Boston in Lincolnshire gave to the realization of this project was acknowledged in the name of its capital. Eight days before announcing his resolve to govern henceforth without Parliaments, Charles granted the charter which established the colony of Massachusetts; and by the Puritans at large the grant was at once regarded as a Providential call. Out of the failure of their great constitutional struggle, and the pressing danger to "godliness" in England, rose the dream of a land in the West where religion and liberty could find a safe and lasting home. The third Parliament of Charles was hardly dissolved, when "conclusions" for the establishment of a great colony on the other side the Atlantic were circulating among gentry and traders, and descriptions of the new country of Massachusetts were talked over in every Puritan household. The proposal was welcomed with the quiet, stern enthusiasm which marked the temper of the time; but the words of a well-known emigrant show how hard it was even for the sternest enthusiasts to tear themselves from their native land. "I shall call that my country," said John Winthrop, in answer to feelings of this sort, "where I may most glorify God and enjoy the presence of my dearest friends." The answer was accepted, and the Puritan emigration began on a scale such as England had never before seen. The two hundred who first sailed for Salem were soon followed by Winthrop himself with eight hundred men; and seven hundred more followed ere the first year of the Royal tyranny had run its course. Nor were the emigrants, like the earlier colonists of the South, "broken men," adventurers, bankrupts, criminals; or simply poor men and artisans, like the Pilgrim Fathers of the *Mayflower*. They were in great part men of the professional and middle classes; some of them men of large landed estate, some zealous clergymen like Cotton, Hooker, and Roger Williams, some shrewd London lawyers, or young scholars from Oxford. The bulk were god-fearing farmers from Lincolnshire and the Eastern counties. They desired in fact "only the best" as sharers in their enterprise; men driven forth from their fatherland not by earthly want, or by the greed of gold, or by the lust of adventure, but by the fear of God, and the zeal for a godly worship. But strong as was their zeal, it was not without a wrench that they tore themselves from their English homes. "Farewell, dear England!" was the cry which burst from the first little company of emigrants as its shores faded from their sight. "Our hearts," wrote Winthrop's followers to the brethren whom they had left behind, "shall be fountains of tears for your everlasting welfare, when we shall be in our poor cottages in the wilderness."

1630

Laud
and the
Puritans

During the next two years, as the sudden terror which had found so violent an outlet in Eliot's warnings died for the moment away, there was a lull in the emigration. But the measures of Laud soon revived the panic of the Puritans. The shrewdness of James had read the very heart of the man, when Buckingham pressed for his first advancement to the see of St. David's. "He hath a restless

spirit," said the old King, "which cannot see when things are well, but loves to toss and change, and to bring matters to a pitch of reformation floating in his own brain. Take him with you, but by my soul you will repent it." Cold, pedantic, ridiculous, superstitious as he was (he notes in his diary the entry of a robin-red-breast into his study as a matter of grave moment), William Laud rose out of the mass of court-prelates by his industry, his personal unselfishness, his remarkable capacity for administration. At a later period, when immersed in State-business, he found time to acquire so complete a knowledge of commercial affairs that the London merchants themselves owned him a master in matters of trade. But his real influence was derived from the unity of his purpose. He directed all the power of a clear, narrow mind, and a dogged will, to the realization of a single aim. His resolve was to raise the Church of England to what he conceived to be its real position as a branch, though a reformed branch, of the great Catholic Church throughout the world; protesting alike against the innovations of Rome and the innovations of Calvin, and basing its doctrines and usages on those of the Christian communion in the centuries which preceded the Council of Nicæa. The first step in the realization of such a theory was the severance of whatever ties had hitherto united the English Church to the Reformed Churches of the Continent. In Laud's view episcopal succession was of the essence of a Church, and by their rejection of bishops, the Lutheran and Calvinistic Churches of Germany and Switzerland had ceased to be Churches at all. The freedom of worship therefore which had been allowed to the Huguenot refugees from France, or the Walloons from Flanders, was suddenly withdrawn; and the requirement of conformity with the Anglican ritual drove them in crowds from the southern ports to seek toleration in Holland. The same conformity was required from the English soldiers and merchants abroad, who had hitherto attended without scruple the services of the Calvinistic churches. The English ambassador in Paris was forbidden to visit the Huguenot conventicle at Charenton. As Laud drew further from the Protestants of the Continent, he drew, consciously or unconsciously, nearer to Rome. His theory owned Rome as a true branch of the Church, though severed from it of England by errors and innovations against which Laud vigorously protested. But with the removal of these obstacles union would naturally follow, and his dream was that of bridging over the gulf which ever since the Reformation had parted the two Churches. The secret offer of a cardinal's hat proved Rome's sense that Laud was doing his work for her; while his rejection of it, and his own reiterated protestations, prove equally that he was doing it unconsciously. Union with the great body of Catholicism, indeed, he regarded as a work which only time could bring about, but for which he could prepare the Church of England by raising it to a higher standard of Catholic feeling and Catholic practice. The great obstacle in his way was the Puritanism of nine-tenths of the

English people, and on Puritanism he made war without mercy. No sooner had his elevation to the see of Canterbury placed him at the head of the English Church, than he turned the High Commission into a standing attack on the Puritan ministers. Rectors and vicars were scolded, suspended, deprived for "Gospel preaching." The use of the surplice, and the ceremonies most offensive to Puritan feeling, were enforced in every parish. The lectures founded in towns, which were the favourite posts of Puritan preachers, were rigorously suppressed. They found a refuge among the country gentlemen, and the Archbishop withdrew from the country gentlemen the privilege of keeping chaplains, which they had till then enjoyed. As parishes became vacant the High Church bishops filled them with men who denounced Calvinism, and declared passive obedience to the sovereign to be part of the law of God. The Puritans soon felt the stress of this process, and endeavoured to meet it by buying up the appropriations of livings, and securing through feeoffees a succession of Protestant ministers in the parishes of which they were patrons: but Laud cited the feeoffees into the Star Chamber, and roughly put an end to them. Nor was the persecution confined to the clergy. Under the two last reigns the small pocket-Bibles called the Geneva Bibles had become universally popular amongst English laymen; but their marginal notes were found to savour of Calvinism, and their importation was prohibited. The habit of receiving the communion in a sitting posture had become common, but kneeling was now enforced, and hundreds were excommunicated for refusing to comply with the injunction. A more galling means of annoyance was found in the different views of the two religious parties on the subject of Sunday. The Puritans identified the Lord's day with the Jewish Sabbath, and transferred to the one the strict observances which were required for the other. The Laudian clergy, on the other hand, regarded it simply as one among the holidays of the Church, and encouraged their flocks in the pastimes and recreations after service which had been common before the Reformation. The Crown under James had taken part with the High Churchmen, and had issued a "Book of Sports" which recommended certain games as lawful and desirable on the Lord's day. The Parliament, as might be expected, was stoutly on the other side, and had forbidden Sunday pastimes by statute. The general religious sense of the country was undoubtedly tending to a stricter observance of the day, when Laud brought the contest to a sudden issue. He summoned the Chief-Justice, Richardson, who had enforced the statute in the western shires, to the Council-table, and rated him so violently that the old man came out complaining he had been all but choked by a pair of lawn sleeves. He then ordered every minister to read the Royal declaration in favour of Sunday pastimes from the pulpit. One Puritan minister had the wit to obey, and to close the reading with the significant hint, "you have heard read, good people, both the commandment of God and the command-

ment of man! Obey which you please." But the bulk refused to comply with the Archbishop's will. The result followed at which Laud no doubt had aimed. Hundreds of Puritan ministers were cited before the High Commission, and silenced or deprived. In the diocese of Norwich alone thirty parochial ministers were expelled from their cures.

The suppression of Puritanism in the ranks of the clergy was only a preliminary to the real work on which the Archbishop's mind was set, the preparation for Catholic reunion by the elevation of the clergy to a Catholic standard in doctrine and ritual. Laud publicly avowed his preference of an unmarried to a married priesthood. Some of the bishops, and a large part of the new clergy who occupied the posts from which the Puritan ministers had been driven, advocated doctrines and customs which the Reformers had denounced as sheer Papistry; the practice, for instance, of auricular confession, a real presence in the Sacrament, or prayers for the dead. One prelate, Montagu, was in heart a convert to Rome. Another, Goodman, died acknowledging himself a Papist. Meanwhile Laud was indefatigable in his efforts to raise the civil and political status of the clergy to the point which it had reached ere the fatal blow of the Reformation fell on the priesthood. Among the archives of his see lies a large and costly volume in vellum, containing a copy of such records in the Tower as concerned the privileges of the clergy. Its compilation was entered in the Archbishop's diary as one among the "twenty-one things which I have projected to do if God bless me in them," and as among the fifteen to which before his fall he had been enabled to add his emphatic "done." The power of the Bishops' Courts, which had long fallen into decay, revived under his patronage. In 1636 he was able to induce the King to raise a prelate, Juxon, Bishop of London, to the highest civil post in the realm, that of Lord High Treasurer. "No Churchman had it since Henry the Seventh's time," Laud comments proudly. "I pray God bless him to carry it so that the Church may have honour, and the State service and content by it. And now, if the Church will not hold up themselves, under God I can do no more." As he aimed at a higher standard of Catholicism in the clergy, so he aimed at a nearer approach to the pomp of Catholicism in public worship. His conduct in his own house at Lambeth brings out with singular vividness the reckless courage with which he threw himself across the religious instincts of a time when the spiritual aspect of worship was overpowering in most men's minds its æsthetic and devotional sides. Men noted as a fatal omen the accident which marked his first entry into Lambeth; for the overladen ferry-boat upset in the passage of the river, and though the horses and servants were saved, the Archbishop's coach remained at the bottom of the Thames. But no omen, carefully as he might note it, brought a moment's hesitation to the bold, narrow mind of the new Primate. His first act, he boasted, was the setting about a restoration of his chapel; and, as

Laud
and the
Clergy

Laud managed it, his restoration was the simple undoing of all that had been done there by his predecessors since the Reformation. In Edward's time iconoclasm had dashed the stained glass from its windows, in Elizabeth's time the communion table had been moved into the middle of the chapel. It was probably Abbot who had abolished the organ and choir. Abbot, indeed, had put the finishing stroke on all attempts at a higher ceremonial. Neither he nor his household would bow at the name of Christ. The credence table had disappeared. Copes, still in use at the Communion in Parker's day, had ceased to be used in Laud's. Bare as its worship was, however, the chapel of Lambeth House was one of the most conspicuous among the ecclesiastical buildings of the time; it had seen the daily worship of every Primate since Cranmer, and was a place "whither many of the nobility, judges, clergy, and persons of all sorts, as well strangers as natives, usually resorted." But to Laud its state seemed intolerable. With characteristic energy he aided with his own hands in the replacement of the painted glass in its windows, and racked his wits in piecing the fragments together. The glazier was scandalized by the Primate's express command to repair and set up again the "broken crucifix" in the east window. The holy table was removed from the centre, and set altarwise against the eastern wall, with a cloth of arras behind it, on which was embroidered the history of the Last Supper. The elaborate woodwork of the screen, the rich copes of the chaplain, the silver candlesticks, the credence table, the organ and the choir, the stately ritual, the bowings at the sacred name, the genuflections to the altar, made the chapel at last such a model of worship as Laud desired. If he could not exact an equal pomp of devotion in other quarters, he exacted as much as he could. Bowing to the altar was introduced into all cathedral churches. A royal injunction ordered the removal of the communion table, which for the last half-century or more had in almost every parish church stood in the middle of the nave, back to its pre-Reformation position in the chancel, and secured it from profanation by a rail. The removal implied, and was understood to imply, a recognition of the Real Presence, and a denial of the doctrine which Englishmen generally held about the Lord's Supper. But, strenuous as was the resistance Laud encountered, his pertinacity and severity warred it down. Vicars who denounced the change from their pulpits were fined, imprisoned, and deprived of their benefices. Churchwardens who refused or delayed to obey the injunction were rated at the Commission-table, and frightened into compliance.

The
Puritan
Colonies

In their last Remonstrance to the King the Commons had denounced Laud as the chief assailant of the Protestant character of the Church of England; and every year of his Primacy showed him bent upon justifying the accusation. His policy was no longer the purely conservative policy of Parker or Whitgift; it was aggressive and revolutionary. His "new counsels" threw whatever force there was in the feeling of conservatism into the hands

of the Puritan, for it was the Puritan who now seemed to be defending the old character of the Church of England against its Primate's attacks. But backed as Laud was by the power of the Crown, the struggle became more hopeless every day. The Puritan saw his ministers silenced or deprived, his Sabbath profaned, the most sacred act of his worship brought near, as he fancied, to the Roman mass. Roman doctrine met him from the pulpit, Roman practices met him in the Church. We can hardly wonder that with such a world around them "godly people in England began to apprehend a special hand of Providence in raising this plantation" in Massachusetts; "and their hearts were generally stirred to come over." It was in vain that weaker men returned to bring news of hardships and dangers, and told how two hundred of the new comers had perished with their first winter. A letter from Winthrop told how the rest toiled manfully on. "We now enjoy God and Jesus Christ," he wrote to those at home, "and is not that enough? I thank God I like so well to be here as I do not repent my coming. I would not have altered my course though I had foreseen all these afflictions. I never had more content of mind." With the strength and manliness of Puritanism, its bigotry and narrowness had crossed the Atlantic too. Roger Williams, a young minister who held the doctrine of freedom of conscience, was driven from the new settlement, to become a preacher among the settlers of Rhode Island. The bitter resentment stirred in the emigrants by persecution at home was seen in their abolition of Episcopacy and their prohibition of the use of the Book of Common Prayer. The intensity of its religious sentiments turned the colony into a theocracy. "To the end that the body of the Commons may be preserved of honest and good men, it was ordered and agreed that for the time to come no man shall be admitted to the freedom of the body politic but such as are members of some of the churches within the bounds of the same." As Laud's hands grew heavier the number of Puritan emigrants rose fast. Three thousand new colonists arrived from England in a single year. The landing of Harry Vane, the son of a Secretary of State, and destined to play one of the first parts in the coming revolution, seemed to herald the coming of the very heads of the Puritan movement. The story that a royal embargo alone prevented Cromwell from crossing the seas is probably unfounded, but it is certain that nothing but the great change which followed on the Scotch rising prevented the flight of men of the highest rank. Lord Warwick secured the proprietorship of the Connecticut valley. Lord Saye and Sele and Lord Brooke began negotiations for transferring themselves to the New World. Hampden purchased a tract of land on the Narragansett. The growing stream of meaner emigrants marks the terrible pressure of the time. Between the sailing of Winthrop's expedition and the assembly of the Long Parliament, in the space, that is, of ten or eleven years, two hundred emigrant ships had crossed the Atlantic, and twenty thousand Englishmen had found a refuge in the West.

[*Authorities.*—To those already mentioned may be added the "Stratford Letters and Despatches"; the "Autobiography of Sir Simonds d'Ewes"; Baillie's "Letters and Journals," for the relations between England and Scotland under Charles I. Among modern works may be mentioned, in addition to those already mentioned, Hume Brown, "History of Scotland," and Andrew Lang, "History of Scotland"; and Traill, "Strafford."]

The
Suspend-
tion
of Parlia-
ment

At the opening of his Third Parliament Charles had hinted in ominous words that the continuance of Parliament at all depended on its compliance with his will. "If you do not your duty," said the King, "mine would then order me to use those other means which God has put into my hand." The threat, however, failed to break the resistance of the Commons, and the ominous words passed into a settled policy. "We have showed," said a Proclamation which followed on the dissolution of the Houses, "by our frequent meeting our people, our love to the use of Parliament; yet, the late abuse having for the present driven us unwillingly out of that course, we shall account it presumption for any to prescribe any time unto us for Parliament."

No Parliament in fact met for eleven years. But it would be unjust to charge the King at the outset of this period with any definite scheme of establishing a tyranny, or of changing what he conceived to be the older constitution of the realm. He "hated the very name of Parliaments," but in spite of his hate he had no settled purpose of abolishing them. His belief was that England would in time recover its senses, and that then Parliament might re-assemble without inconvenience to the Crown. In the interval, however long it might be, he proposed to govern single-handed by the use of "those means which God had put into his hands." Resistance, indeed, he was resolved to put down. The leaders of the country party in the last Parliament were thrown into prison; and Eliot died, the first martyr of English liberty, in the Tower. Men were forbidden to speak of the re-assembling of a Parliament. Laud was encouraged to break the obstinate opposition of the Puritans by the enforcement of religious uniformity. But here the King stopped. The opportunity which might have suggested dreams of organized despotism to a Richelieu, suggested only means of filling the Exchequer to Charles. He had in truth neither the grander nor the meaner instincts of the born tyrant. He did not seek to gain an absolute power over his people, because he believed that his absolute power was already a part of the constitution of the country. He set up no standing army to secure it, partly because he was poor, but yet more because his faith in his position was such that he never dreamt of any effectual resistance. His expedients for freeing the Crown from that dependence on Parliaments against which his pride as a sovereign revolted were simply

peace and economy. To secure the first he sacrificed an opportunity greater than ever his father had trodden under foot. The fortunes of the great struggle in Germany were suddenly reversed at this juncture by the appearance of Gustavus Adolphus, with a Swedish army, in the heart of Germany. Tilly was defeated and slain; the Catholic League humbled in the dust; Munich, the capital of its Bavarian leader, occupied by the Swedish army, and the Lutheran princes of North Germany freed from the pressure of the Imperial soldiery; while the Emperor himself, trembling within the walls of Vienna, was driven to call for aid from Wallenstein, an adventurer whose ambition he dreaded, but whose army could alone arrest the progress of the Protestant conqueror. The ruin that James had wrought was suddenly averted; but the victories of Protestantism had no more power to draw Charles out of the petty circle of his politics at home than its defeats had had power to draw James out of the circle of his imbecile diplomacy. To support Gustavus by arms, or even by an imposing neutrality, meant a charge on the Royal Treasury which necessitated a fresh appeal to the Commons; and this appeal Charles was resolved never to make. At the very crisis of the struggle therefore he patched up a hasty peace with both the two great Catholic powers of France and Spain, and fell back from any interference with the affairs of the Continent. His whole attention was absorbed by the pressing question of revenue. The debt was a large one; and the ordinary income of the Crown, aided by parliamentary supplies, was utterly inadequate to meet its ordinary expenditure. Charles was himself frugal and abhorious; and the administration of Weston, the new Lord Treasurer, whom he created Earl of Portland, contrasted advantageously with the waste and extravagance of the government under Buckingham. But economy failed to close the yawning gulf of the Treasury, and the course into which Charles was driven by the financial pressure showed with how wise a prescience the Commons had fixed on the point of arbitrary taxation as the chief danger to constitutional freedom.

It is curious to see to what shifts the Royal pride was driven in its effort at once to fill the Exchequer, and yet to avoid, as far as it could, any direct breach of constitutional law in the imposition of taxes by the sole authority of the Crown. The dormant powers of the prerogative were strained to their utmost. The right of the Crown to force knighthood on the landed gentry was revived, in order to squeeze them into composition for the refusal of it. Fines were levied on them for the redress of defects in their title-deeds. A Commission of the Forests exacted large sums from the neighbouring landowners for their encroachments on Crown lands. London, the special object of courtly dislike, on account of its stubborn Puritanism, was brought within the sweep of Royal extortion by the enforcement of an illegal proclamation which James had issued, prohibiting the extension. Every house throughout the large suburban districts in which the prohibition had been

1629
to
1640

The
King's
Rule

disregarded was only saved from demolition by the payment of three years' rental to the Crown. The Treasury gained a hundred thousand pounds by this clever stroke, and Charles gained the bitter enmity of the great city whose strength and resources were fatal to him in the coming war. Though the Catholics were no longer troubled by any active persecution, and the Lord Treasurer was in heart a Papist, the penury of the Exchequer forced the Crown to maintain the old system of fines for "recusancy." Vexatious measures of extortion such as these were far less hurtful to the State than the conversion of justice into a means of supplying the Royal necessities by means of the Star Chamber. The jurisdiction of the King's Council had been revived, as we have seen, by Wolsey as a check on the nobles; and it had received great development, especially on the side of criminal law, during the Tudor reigns. Forgery, perjury, riot, maintenance, fraud, libel, and conspiracy, were the chief offences cognizable in this Court, but its scope extended to every misdemeanor, and especially to charges where, from the imperfection of the common law, or the power of offenders, justice was baffled in the lower Courts. Its process resembled that of Chancery: it usually acted on an information laid before it by the King's Attorney. Both witnesses and accused were examined on oath by special interrogatories, and the Court was at liberty to adjudge any punishment short of death. The possession of such a weapon would have been fatal to liberty under a great tyrant; under Charles it was turned simply to the profit of the Exchequer. Large numbers of cases which would ordinarily have come before the Courts of Common Law were called before the Star Chamber, simply for the purpose of levying fines for the Crown. The same motive accounts for the enormous penalties which were exacted for offences of a trivial character. The marriage of a gentleman with his niece was punished by the forfeiture of twelve thousand pounds, and fines of four and five thousand pounds were awarded for brawls between lords of the Court. Money for the fleet was procured by a stretch of the prerogative which led afterwards to the great contest over ship-money. The legal research of Noy, one of the law officers of the Crown, found precedents among the records in the Tower for the provision of ships for the King's use by the port-towns of the kingdom, and for the furnishing of their equipment by the maritime counties. The precedents dated from times when no permanent fleet existed, and when sea warfare was waged by vessels lent for the moment by the various ports. But they were seized as a means of equipping a permanent navy without cost to the Exchequer; and the writs which were issued to London and the chief English ports were enforced by fine and imprisonment. Shifts of this kind, however, did little to fill the Treasury, great as was the annoyance they caused. Charles was driven from courses of doubtful legality to a more open defiance of law. Monopolies, abandoned by Elizabeth, extinguished by Act of Parliament under James, and

denounced with his own assent in the Petition of Right, were revived on a scale far more gigantic than had been seen before, the companies who undertook them paying a fixed duty on their profits as well as a large sum for the original concession of the monopoly. Wine, soap, salt, and almost every article of domestic consumption fell into the hands of monopolists, and rose in price out of all proportion to the profit gained by the Crown. "They sup in our cup," Colepepper said afterwards in the Long Parliament, "they dip in our dish, they sit by our fire; we find them in the dye-fat, the wash bowls, and the powdering tub. They share with the cutler in his box. They have marked and sealed us from head to foot." Nothing, indeed, better marks the character of Charles than his conduct as to the Petition of Right. He had given his assent to it, he was fond of bidding Parliament rely on his "Royal word," but the thought of his pledge seems never to have troubled him for an instant. From the moment he began his career of government without a Parliament every one of the abuses he had promised to abolish, such as illegal imprisonment, or tampering with the judges, was resorted to as a matter of course. His penury, in spite of the financial expedients we have described, drove him inevitably on to the fatal rock of illegal taxation. The exaction of Customs duties went on as of old at the ports. Writs were issued for the levy of "benevolences" from the shires. The resistance of the London merchants was roughly put down by the Star Chamber. Chambers, an alderman of London, who complained bitterly that men were worse off in England than in Turkey, was ruined by a fine of two thousand pounds, and died broken-hearted in prison. The freeholders of the counties were more difficult to deal with. When those of Cornwall were called together at Bodmin to contribute to a voluntary loan, half the hundreds refused, and the yield of the rest came to little more than two thousand pounds. One of the Cornishmen has left an amusing record of the scene before the Commissioners appointed for assessment of the loan. "Some with great words and threatenings, some with persuasions," he says, "were drawn to it. I was like to have been complimented out of my money; but knowing with whom I had to deal, I held, when I talked with them, my hands fast in my pockets."

Vexatious indeed and illegal as were the proceedings of the Crown. **Strafford** here seems to have been little apprehension of any permanent danger to freedom in the country at large. To those who read the letters of the time there is something inexpressibly touching in the general faith of their writers in the ultimate victory of the Law. Charles was obstinate, but obstinacy was too common a foible amongst Englishmen to rouse any vehement resentment. The people were as stubborn as their King, and their political sense told them that the slightest disturbance of affairs must shake down the financial fabric which Charles was slowly building up, and force him back on subsidies and a Parliament. Meanwhile they could wait for better days, and their patience was aided by the

1629

17

1640

general prosperity of the country. The long peace was producing its inevitable results in a vast extension of commerce and a rise of manufactures in the towns of the West Riding of Yorkshire. Fresh land was being brought into cultivation, and a great scheme was set on foot for reclaiming the Fens. The new wealth of the country gentry, through the increase of rent, was seen in the splendour of the houses which they were raising. The contrast of this peace and prosperity with the ruin and bloodshed of the Continent afforded a ready argument to the friends of the King's system. So tranquil was the outer appearance of the country that in Court circles all sense of danger had disappeared. "Some of the greatest statesmen and privy councillors," says May, "would ordinarily laugh when the word, 'liberty of the subject,' was named." There were courtiers bold enough to express their hope that "the King would never need any more Parliaments." But beneath this outer calm "the country," Clarendon honestly tells us while eulogizing the Peace, "was full of pride and mutiny and discontent." Thousands, as we have seen, were quitting England for America. The gentry held aloof from the Court. "The common people in the generality and the country freeholders would rationally argue of their own rights and the oppressions which were laid upon them." If Charles was content to deceive himself, there was one man among his ministers who saw that the people were right in their policy of patience, and that unless other measures were taken the fabric of Royal despotism would fall at the first breath of adverse fortune. Sir Thomas Wentworth, a great Yorkshire landowner and one of the representatives of his county in Parliament, had stood for years past among the more prominent members of the Country party in the Commons. But from the first moment of his appearance in public his passionate desire had been to find employment in the service of the Crown. At the close of the preceding reign he was already connected with the Court, he had secured a seat in Yorkshire for one of the Royal ministers, and was believed to be on the high road to a peerage. But the consciousness of political ability which spurred his ambition roused the jealousy of Buckingham; and the haughty pride of Wentworth was flung by repeated slights into an attitude of opposition, which his eloquence—grander in its sudden outbursts, though less earnest and sustained, than that of Eliot—soon rendered formidable. But his patriotism was still little more than hostility to the favourite, and his intrigues at Court roused Buckingham to crush, by a signal insult, the rival whose genius he instinctively dreaded. While sitting in his court as sheriff of Yorkshire, Wentworth received the announcement of his dismissal from office, and of the gift of his post to Sir John Savile, his rival in the county. "Since they will thus weakly breathe on me a seeming disgrace in the public face of my country," he said with a characteristic outburst of contemptuous pride, "I shall crave leave to wipe it away as openly, as easily!" He sprang at once to the front of the Commons in urging

1629
to
1640

the Petition of Right. Whether in that crisis of Wentworth's life some nobler impulse, some true passion for the freedom he was to betray mingled with his thirst for revenge, it is hard to tell. But his words were words of fire. "If he did not faithfully insist for the common liberty of the subject to be preserved whole and entire," it was thus he closed one of his speeches on the Petition, "it was his desire that he might be set as a beacon on a hill for all men else to wonder at."

It is as such a beacon that his name has stood from that time to this. The death of Buckingham had no sooner removed the obstacle that stood between his ambition and the end at which it had aimed throughout, than the cloak of patriotism was flung by. Wentworth was admitted to the Royal Council, and as he took his seat at the board he promised to "vindicate the Monarchy for ever from the conditions and restraints of subjects." So great was the faith in his zeal and power which he knew how to breathe into his Royal master, that he was at once raised to the peerage, and rewarded with the high post of Lord President of the North. Charles had good ground for this rapid confidence in his new minister. In Wentworth, or as we may call him from the title he assumed at the close of his life, in the Earl of Strafford, the very genius of tyranny was embodied. He was far too clear-sighted to share his master's belief that the arbitrary power which Charles was wielding formed any part of the old constitution of the country, or to believe that the mere lapse of time would so change the temper of Englishmen as to reconcile them to despotism. He knew that absolute rule was a new thing in England, and that the only way of permanently establishing it was not by reasoning, or by the force of custom, but by the force of fear. His system was the expression of his own inner temper; and the dark gloomy countenance, the full heavy eye, which meet us in Strafford's portrait are the best commentary on his policy of "Thorough." It was by the sheer strength of his genius, by the terror his violence inspired amid the meaner men whom Buckingham had left, by the general sense of his power, that he had forced himself upon the Court. He had none of the small arts of a courtier. His air was that of a silent, proud, passionate man; when he first appeared at Whitehall his rough uncourtly manners provoked a smile in the Royal circle, but he smile soon died into a general hate. The Queen, frivolous and needlesome as she was, detested him; his fellow-ministers intrigued against him, and seized on his hot speeches against the great lords, his quarrels with the Royal household, his transports of passion at the very Council-table, to ruin him in his master's favour. The King himself, while steadily supporting him against his rivals, was utterly unable to understand his drift. Charles valued him as an administrator, disdainful of private ends, crushing great and small with the same haughty indifference to men's love or hate, and devoted to the one aim of building up the power of the Crown. But in his purpose of preparing for the great struggle with freedom

1629 which he saw before him, of building up by force such a despotism
to in England as Richelieu was building up in France, and of thus
1640 making England as great in Europe as France had been made by
Richelieu, he could look for little sympathy and less help from
the King.

Wentworth in Ireland
Wentworth's genius turned impatiently to a sphere where it could act alone, untrammelled by the hindrances it encountered at home. His purpose was to prepare for the coming contest by the provision of a fixed revenue, arsenals, fortresses, and a standing army, and it was in Ireland that he resolved to find them. He saw in the miserable country which had hitherto been a drain upon the resources of the Crown the lever he needed for the overthrow of English freedom. It was easy by the balance of Catholic against Protestant to make both parties dependent on the Royal authority; the rights of conquest, which in Strafford's theory vested the whole land in the absolute possession of the Crown, gave him a large field for his administrative ability; and for the rest he trusted, and trusted justly, to the force of his genius and of his will. In 1632 he was made Lord Deputy, and five years later his aim seemed all but realized. "The King," he wrote to Laud, "is as absolute here as any prince in the world can be." Wentworth's government indeed was a mere rule of terror. Archbishop Usher, with almost every name which we can respect in the island, was the object of his insult and oppression. His tyranny strode over all legal bounds. A few insolent words, construed as mutiny, were enough to bring Lord Mountnorris before a council of war, and to inflict on him a sentence of death. In one instance Wentworth, it is said, used his power for the basest personal ends: an adulterous passion for the Chancellor's daughter-in-law led him to order that peer to settle his estate in her favour, and, on his refusal, to deprive him of office. But such instances were rare. His tyranny aimed at public ends, and in Ireland the heavy hand of a single despot delivered the mass of the people at any rate from the local despotism of a hundred masters. The Irish landowners were for the first time made to feel themselves amenable to the law. Justice was enforced, outrage was repressed, the condition of the clergy was to some extent raised, the sea was cleared of the pirates who infested it. The foundation of the linen manufacture which was to bring wealth to Ulster, and the first development of Irish commerce, date from the Lieutenancy of Wentworth. But good government was only a means with him for further ends. The noblest work to be done in Ireland was the bringing about a reconciliation between Catholic and Protestant, and an obliteration of the anger and thirst for vengeance which had been raised by the Ulster Plantation. Strafford, on the other hand, angered the Protestants by a toleration of Catholic worship and a suspension of the persecution which had feebly begun against the priesthood, while he fed the irritation of the Catholics by schemes for a Plantation of Connaught. His whole aim was to

encourage a disunion which left both parties dependent for support and protection on the Crown. It was a policy which was to end in bringing about the horrors of the Irish Massacre, the vengeance of Cromwell, and the long series of atrocities on both sides which make the story of the country he ruined so terrible to tell. But for the hour it left Ireland helpless in his hands. He had doubled the revenue. He had raised an army. He felt himself strong enough at last, in spite of the panic with which Charles heard his project, to summon an Irish Parliament. His aim was to read a lesson to England and the King, by showing how completely that dreaded thing, a Parliament, could be made the organ of the Royal will; and his success was complete. Two-thirds, indeed, of an Irish House of Commons consisted of the representatives of wretched villages, the pocket-boroughs of the Crown; while absent peers were forced to send in their proxies to the Council to be used at its pleasure. But precautions were hardly needed. The two Houses trembled at the stern master who bade their members not let the King "find them muttering, or, to speak it more truly, nutinying in corners," and voted with a perfect docility the means of maintaining an army of five thousand foot and five hundred horse. Even had the subsidy been refused, the result would have been the same. "I would undertake," wrote Strafford, "upon the peril of my head, to make the King's army able to subsist and to provide for itself among them without their help."

1629
to
1640

While Strafford was thus working out his system of "Thorough" on one side of St. George's Channel, it was being carried out on the other by a mind inferior, indeed, to his own in genius, but almost equal to it in courage and tenacity. On the death of Weston, Laud became virtually first minister of the Crown at the English Council-board. We have already seen with what a reckless and unscrupulous activity he was crushing Puritanism in the English Church, and driving Puritan ministers from English pulpits; and in this work his new position enabled him to back the authority of the High Commission by the terrors of the Star Chamber. It was a work, indeed, which to Laud's mind was at once civil and religious: he had allied the cause of ecclesiastical dogmatism with that of absolutism in the State; and, while borrowing the power of the Crown to crush ecclesiastical liberty, he brought the influence of the Church to bear on the ruin of civil freedom. But his power stopped at the Scotch frontier. Across the Border stood a Church with bishops indeed, but without a ritual, modelled on the doctrine and system of Geneva, Calvinist in teaching and in government. The mere existence of such a Church gave countenance to English Puritanism, and threatened in any hour of ecclesiastical weakness bringing a Presbyterian influence to bear on the Church of England. With Scotland, indeed, Laud could only deal indirectly through Charles, for the King was jealous of any interference of his English ministers or Parliament with his Northern Kingdom. But Charles was himself earnest to deal with it. He had imbibed his father's

Scotland
and the
Stuarts

1635

1620
to
1640

hatred of the Presbyterian system, and from the outset of his reign he had been making advance after advance towards the re-establishment of Episcopacy. To understand, however, what had been done, and the relations which had by this time grown up between Scotland and its King, we must take up again the brief thread of its history which we broke at the moment when Mary fled for refuge over the English border.

1570

After a few years of wise and able rule, the triumph of Protestantism under the Earl of Murray had been interrupted by his assassination, by the revival of the Queen's faction, and by the renewal of civil war. The reaction, however, was a brief one, and the general horror excited by the Massacre of St. Bartholomew completed the ruin of the Catholic cause. Edinburgh, the last fortress held in Mary's name, surrendered to an English force sent by Elizabeth; and its captain, the chivalrous Kirkcaldy of Grange, was hung for treason at the market-cross. The people of the Lowlands, indeed, were now staunch for the new faith; and the Protestant Church rose rapidly after the death of Knox into a power which appealed at every critical juncture to the deeper feelings of the nation at large. In the battle with Catholicism the bishops had clung to the old religion; and the new faith, left without episcopal interference, and influenced by the Genevan training of Knox, borrowed from Calvin its model of Church government, as it borrowed its theology. The system of Presbyterianism, as it grew up at the outset without direct recognition from the law, bound Scotland together by its administrative organization, its church synods and general assemblies, while it called the people at large, by the power it conferred upon the lay elders in each congregation, to a voice, and, as it proved, a decisive voice, in the administration of affairs. Its government by ministers gave it the look of an ecclesiastical despotism, but no Church constitution has proved in practice so democratic as that of Scotland. Its influence in raising the nation at large to a consciousness of its own power is shown by the change which passes, from the moment of its final establishment, over the face of Scotch history. The country ceases to belong to the great nobles, who had turned it into their battle ground ever since the death of Bruce. After the death of the Earl of

1581

Morton, who had put an end to the civil war, and ruled the country for five years with a wise and steady hand, the possession of the young sovereign, James the Sixth, was disputed indeed by one noble and another; but the power of the Church was felt more and more over nobles and King. Melville, who had succeeded to much of Knox's authority, claimed for the ecclesiastical body an independence of the State which James hardly dared to resent; while he writhed helplessly beneath the sway which public opinion, expressed through the General Assembly of the Church, exercised over the civil government. In the great crisis of the Armada his hands were fettered by the league with England which it forced upon him. The democratic boldness of Calvinism allied itself with

the spiritual pride of the Presbyterian ministers in their dealings with the Crown. Melville in open Council took James by the sleeve, and called him "God's silly vassal!" "There are two Kings," he told him, when James extolled his Royal authority, "and two kingdoms in Scotland. There is Christ Jesus the King, and His Kingdom the Kirk, whose subject King James the Sixth is, and of whose kingdom not a king, nor a lord, nor a head, but a member." The words and tone of the great preacher were bitterly remembered when James mounted the English throne. "A Scottish Presbytery," he said at the Hampton Court Conference, "as well fitteth with monarchy as God and the Devil! No Bishop, no King!" But Scotland was resolved on "no bishop." Episcopacy had become identified among the more zealous Scotchmen with the old Catholicism they had shaken off. When he appeared at a later time before the English Council-table, Melville took the Archbishop of Canterbury by the sleeves of his rochet, and, shaking them in his manner, called them Romish rags, and the mark of the Beast. Four years, therefore, after the ruin of the Armada, Episcopacy was formally abolished, and the Presbyterian system established by law as the mode of government of the Church of Scotland. The rule of the Church was placed in a General Assembly, with subordinate Provincial Synods, Presbyteries, and Kirk Sessions, by which its discipline was carried down to every member of a congregation. As yet, however, the authority of the Assembly was hardly felt north of the Tay, while the system of Presbytery had by no means won the hold it afterwards gained over the people, even to the south of that river; and James had no sooner succeeded to the English throne than he used his new power in a struggle to undo the work which had been done. Melville, after his scornful protest at the Council-table, was banished from Scotland, and died in exile at Sedan. The old sees were restored, and three of the new bishops were consecrated in England, and returned to communicate the gift of Apostolical succession to their colleagues. But Episcopacy remained simply a name. The Presbyterian organization remained untouched in doctrine or discipline. All that James could do was to set his prelates to preside as permanent moderators in the provincial synods, and to prevent the Assembly from meeting without a summons from the Crown. The struggle, however, went on throughout his reign with varying success. An attempt to vest the government of the Church in the King and bishops was foiled by the protest of the Presbyterian party; but the General Assembly, gathered at Perth, was induced to adopt some of the ecclesiastical practices most distasteful to them. The earlier policy of Charles, though it followed his father's line of action, effected little save a partial restoration of Church-lands, which the lords were forced to surrender. But Laud had no sooner become minister than his vigorous action made itself felt. The king's first acts were directed rather to points of outer observance than to any attack on the actual fabric of Presbyterian organiza-

1620
to
1640

1592

1610

1629
to
1640
—
1633

tion. The Estates were induced to withdraw the control of ecclesiastical apparel from the Assembly, and to commit it to the Crown; a step soon followed by a resumption of their episcopal costume on the part of the Scotch bishops. When the Bishop of Moray preached before Charles in his rochet, on the King's visit to Edinburgh, it was the first instance of its use since the Reformation. The innovation was followed by the issue of a Royal warrant which directed all ministers to use the surplice in divine worship. From costume, however, the busy minister soon passed to weightier matters. Many years had gone by since he had vainly invited James to draw his Scotch "subjects to a nearer conjunction with the liturgy and canons of this nation." "I sent him back again," said the shrewd old King, "with the frivolous draft he had drawn. For all that, he feared not my anger, but assaulted me again with another ill-fangled platform to make that stubborn Kirk stoop more to the English platform, but I durst not play fast and loose with my word. He knows not the stomach of that people." But Laud had known how to wait, and his time had come at last. A new diocese, that of Edinburgh, was created, and the Archbishop of St. Andrews was named chancellor of the realm. A book of Canons, issued by the sole authority of the King, ignored Assembly and Kirk Session, and practically abolished the whole Presbyterian system. As daring a stretch of the prerogative superseded what was known as Knox's Liturgy—the book of Common Order drawn up on the Genevan model by that Reformer, and generally used throughout Scotland—by a new Liturgy based on the English Book of Common Prayer. The Liturgy and Canons had been Laud's own handiwork; in their composition the General Assembly had neither been consulted nor recognized, and to enforce them on Scotland was to effect an ecclesiastical revolution of the most serious kind. The books, however, were backed by a Royal Injunction, and Laud flattered himself that the revolution had been wrought.

1636

Milton's
Early
Poems

Triumphant in Scotland, with Scotch Prosbyterianism—as he fancied—at his feet, Laud's hand fell heavier than ever on the English Puritans. There were signs of a change of temper which might have made even a bolder man pause. Thousands, as we have seen, of "the best" scholars, merchants, lawyers, farmers, were flying over the Atlantic to seek freedom and purity of religion in the wilderness. Great landowners and nobles were preparing to follow. Hundreds of ministers had quitted their parsonages rather than abet the Royal insult to the sanctity of the Sabbath. The Puritans who remained among the clergy were giving up their homes rather than consent to the change of the Sacred table into an altar, or to silence in their protests against the new Popery. The noblest of living Englishmen refused to become the priest of a Church whose ministry could only be "bought with servitude and forswearing." We have seen John Milton leave Cambridge, self-dedicated "to that same lot, however mean or high, to which

time leads me and the will of Heaven." But the lot to which these called him was not the ministerial office to which he had been destined from his childhood. In later life he told bitterly the story, how he had been "Church-outed by the prelates." "Coming to some maturity of years, and perceiving what tyranny had invaded the Church, that he who would take orders must subscribe slave, and take an oath withal, which unless he took with a conscience that would retch he must either straight perjure or split his faith, I thought it better to prefer a blameless silence before the sacred office of speaking, bought and begun with servitude and forswearing." In spite therefore of his father's regrets, he retired to a new home which the scrivener had found at Horton, a village in the neighbourhood of Windsor, and quietly busied himself with study and poetry. The poetic impulse of the Renaissance had been slowly dying away under the Stuarts. The stage was falling into mere coarseness and horror; Shakspere had died quietly at Stratford in Milton's childhood; the last and worst play of Ben Jonson appeared in the year of his settlement at Horton; and though Ford and Massinger still lingered on, there were no successors for them but Shirley and Davenant. The philosophic and meditative taste of the age had produced indeed poetic schools of its own: poetic attire had become fashionable in Hall, better known afterwards as a bishop, and had been carried on vigorously by George Wither; the so-called "metaphysical" poetry, the vigorous and pithy expression of a cold and prosaic good sense, began with Sir John Davies, and buried itself in fantastic affectations in Donne; religious verse had become popular in the gloomy allegories of Quarles and the tender refinement which struggles through a tangle of puns and extravagances in George Herbert. But what poetic life really remained was to be found only in the caressing fancy and lively badinage of lyric singers like Herrick, whose grace was untouched by passion and often disfigured by coarseness, and pedantry; or in the school of Spenser's more direct successors where Brown, in his pastorals, and the two Fletchers, Phineas and Giles, in their unreadable allegories, still preserved something of their master's sweetness, if they preserved nothing of his power. Milton was himself a Spenserian; he owned to Dryden in later years that "Spenser was his original," and in some of his earliest lines at Horton he dwells lovingly on "the sage and solemn tunes" of the "Faerie Queen," its "forests and enchantments drear, where more is meant than meets the ear." But of the weakness and affectation which characterized Spenser's successors he had not a trace. In the "Allegro" and "Penseroso," the first results of his retirement at Horton, we catch again the fancy and melody of the Elizabethan verse, the wealth of its imagery, its wide sympathy with nature and man. There is a loss, perhaps, of the older freedom and spontaneity of the Renaissance, a rhetorical rather than passionate turn in the young poet, a striking absence of dramatic power, and a want of precision and exactness even in

1629
to
1640

1633

1629 his picturesque touches. Milton's imagination is not strong enough
 to identify him with the world which he imagines; he stands apart
 1640 from it, and looks at it as from a distance, ordering it and arranging
 it at his will. But if in this respect he falls, both in his earlier and
 later poems, far below Shakspeare or Spenser, the deficiency is all
 but compensated by his nobleness of feeling and expression, the
 severity of his taste, his sustained dignity, and the perfectness and
 completeness of his work. The moral grandeur of the Puritan
 breathes, even in these lighter pieces of his youth, through every
 line. The "Comus" planned as a masque for the festivities which
 the Earl of Bridgewater was holding at Ludlow Castle, rises into
 an almost impassioned pleading for the love of virtue.

Hamp-
 den and
 ship-
 money

The historic interest of Milton's "Comus" lies in its forming
 part of a protest made by the more cultured Puritans at this time
 against the gloomier bigotry which persecution was fostering in
 the party at large. The patience of Englishmen, in fact, was slowly
 wearing out. There was a sudden upgrowth of virulent pamphlets
 of the old Martin Marprelate type. Men, whose names no one asked,
 hawked libels, whose authorship no one knew, from the door of the
 tradesman to the door of the squire. As the hopes of a Parliament
 grew fainter, and men despaired of any legal remedy, violent and
 weak-headed fanatics came, as at such times they always come,
 to the front. Leighton, the father of the saintly Archbishop of that
 name, had given a specimen of their tone at the outset of this
 period, by denouncing the prelates as men of blood, Episcopacy
 as Antichrist, and the Popish queen as a daughter of Heth. The
 1633 "Histrio-mastix" of Prynne, a lawyer distinguished for his con-
 stitutional knowledge, but the most obstinate and narrow-minded
 of men, marked the deepening of Puritan bigotry under the foster-
 ing warmth of Laud's persecution. The book was an attack on
 players as the ministers of Satan, on theatres as the Devil's chapels,
 on hunting, on maypoles, the decking of houses at Christmas with
 evergreens, on cards, music, and false hair. The attack on the stage
 was as offensive to the more cultured minds among the Puritan
 party as to the Court itself; Selden and Whitelock took a promi-
 nent part in preparing the grand masque by which the Inns of
 Court resolved to answer its challenge, and in the following year
 Milton wrote his masque of "Comus" for Ludlow Castle. To leave
 Prynne, however, simply to the censure of wiser men than himself
 was too sensible a course for the angry Primate. No man was ever
 sent to prison before or since for such a sheer mass of nonsense; but
 the prison with which Laud rewarded Prynne's enormous folio
 tamed his spirit so little that a new tract written within its walls
 attacked the bishops as devouring wolves and lords of Lucifer.
 A fellow-prisoner, John Bastwick, declared in his "Litany" that
 "Hell was broke loose, and the Devils in surplices, hoods, copes,
 and rochets, were come among us." Burton, a London clergyman
 silenced by the High Commission, called on all Christians to resist
 the bishops as "robbers of souls, limbs of the Beast, and factors of

1629
to
1640

Antichrist." Raving of this sort, however, though it showed how vast the storm of popular passion was gathering, was not so pressing a difficulty to the Royal ministers at this time as the old difficulty of the Exchequer. The ingenious devices of the Court lawyers, the revived prerogatives, the illegal customs, the fines and confiscations which were alienating one class after another and sowing in home after home the seeds of a bitter hatred to the Crown, had failed to recruit the Treasury. In spite of the severe economy of Charles and his ministers new exactions were necessary, at a time when the rising discontent made every new exaction a challenge to revolt. But danger and difficulty were lost on the temper of the two men who really governed England. To Laud and Strafford, indeed, the King seemed over-cautious, the Star Chamber feeble, the Judges over-scrupulous. "I am for Thorough," the one writes to the other in alternate fits of impatience at the slow progress they are making. Strafford was anxious that his good work might not "be spoiled on that side." Laud echoed the wish, while he envied the free course of the Lord Lieutenant. "You have a good deal of labour here," he writes, "for your proceeding. Go on a' God's name. I have done with expecting of Thorough on this side." The financial pressure was seized by both to force the King on to a bolder course. "The debt of the Crown being taken off," Strafford urged, "you may govern at your will." All pretence of precedents was thrown aside, and Laud resolved to find a permanent revenue in the conversion of the "ship-money" levied on ports and the maritime counties into a general tax imposed by the Royal will on the whole country. The sum expected from the tax was no less than a quarter of a million a year. "I know no reason," Strafford had written significantly, "but you may as well rule by common lawyers in England as I, poor beagle, do here;" and the bench of Judges, remodelled on his hint for the occasion, no longer declared the new impost to be legal than he drew the logical deduction from their decision. "Since it is lawful for the King to impose a tax for the equipment of the navy, it must be equally so for the levy of an army: and the same reason which authorizes him to levy an army to resist, will authorize him to carry that army abroad that he may prevent invasion. Moreover what is law in England is law also in Scotland and Ireland. The decision of the Judges will therefore make the King absolute at home and formidable abroad. Let him only abstain from war for a few years that he may habituate his subjects to the payment of that tax, and in the end he will find himself more powerful and respected than any of his predecessors." But there were men who saw the danger to the nation in this levy of ship-money as clearly as Strafford himself. John Hampden, a friend of Eliot's, a man of consummate ability, unequalled power of persuasion, of a keen intelligence, ripe for ruling, and a character singularly pure and loveable, had already shown the firmness of his temper in his refusal to contribute to the forced loan of 1626. He now repeated his refusal, declared ship-

1629 money an illegal impost, and resolved to rouse the spirit of the
to country by an appeal for protection to the law.

1640

The
Resist-
ance

The news of Hampden's resistance thrilled through England at the very moment when men were roused by the news of resistance in the north. The submission with which Scotland had bent to aggression after aggression found an end at last. The Dean of Edinburgh had no sooner opened the new Prayer Book than a murmur ran through the congregation, and the murmur soon grew into a formidable riot. The Church was cleared, the service read, but the rising discontent frightened the judges into a decision that the Royal writ enjoined the purchase, and not the use, of the Prayer Book. Its use was at once discontinued, and the angry orders which came from England for its restoration were met by a shower of protests from every part of Scotland. The Duke of Lennox alone took sixty-eight petitions with him to the Court; while ministers, nobles, and gentry poured into Edinburgh to organize the national resistance. The effect of these events in Scotland was at once seen in the open demonstration of discontent south of the border. Prynne and his fellow pamphleteers, when Laud dragged them before the Star Chamber as "trumpets of sedition," listened with defiance to their sentence of exposure in the pillory and imprisonment for life; and the crowd who filled Palace Yard to witness their punishment groaned at the cutting off of their ears, and "gave a great shout" when Prynne urged that the sentence on him was contrary to the law. A hundred thousand Londoners lined the road as they passed on the way to prison; and the journey of these "Martyrs," as the spectators called them, was like a triumphal progress. Startled as he was at the sudden burst of popular feeling, Laud was dauntless as ever; and Prynne's entertainers, as he passed through the country, were summoned before the Star Chamber, while the censorship struck fiercer blows at the Puritan press. But the real danger lay not in the libels of silly zealots but in the attitude of Scotland, and in the effect which was being produced in England at large by the trial of Hampden. For twelve days the cause of ship-money was solemnly argued before the full bench of Judges. It was proved that the tax in past times had been levied only in cases of sudden emergency, and confined to the coast and port towns alone, and that even the show of legality had been taken from it by formal Statute and by the Petition of Right. The case was adjourned, but the discussion told not merely on England but on the temper of the Scots. Charles had replied to their petitions by a simple order to all strangers to leave the capital. But the Council was unable to enforce his order; and the nobles and gentry before dispersing to their homes named a body of delegates, under the odd title of "the Tables," who carried on through the winter a series of negotiations with the Crown. The negotiations were interrupted in the following spring by a renewed order for their dispersion, and for the acceptance of a Prayer Book; while the

Nov.

1637

1638

judges in England delivered at last their long-delayed decision on Hampden's case. All save two laid down the broad principle that no Statute prohibiting arbitrary taxation could be pleaded against the King's will. "I never read or heard," said Judge Berkley, "that *lex was rex*, but it is common and most true that *rex is ex*." Finch, the Chief-Justice, summed up the opinions of his fellow judges. "Acts of Parliament to take away the King's Royal power in the defence of his kingdom are void," he said: "they are void Acts of Parliament to bind the King not to command the subjects, their persons, and goods, and I say their money too, for no Acts of Parliament made any difference."

"I wish Mr. Hampden and others to his likeness," the Lord Lieutenant wrote bitterly from Ireland, "were well whipt into their right senses." Amidst the exultation of the Court over the decision of the judges, Wentworth saw clearly that Hampden's work had been done. His resistance had roused England to a sense of the danger to her freedom, and forced into light the real character of the Royal claims. How stern and bitter the temper even of the noblest Puritans had become at last we see in the poem which Milton produced at this time, his elegy of "Lycidas." Its grave and tender lament is broken by a sudden flash of indignation at the dangers around the Church, at the "blind mouths that scarce themselves know how to hold a sheep-hook," and to whom "the hungry sheep look up, and are not fed," while "the grim wolf" of Rome "with privy paw daily devours apace, and nothing said!" The stern resolve of the people to demand justice on their tyrants poke in his threat of the axe. Strafford and Laud, and Charles himself, had yet to reckon with "that two-handed engine at the door" which stood "ready to smite once, and smite no more." But stern as was the general resolve, there was no need for immediate action, for the difficulties which were gathering in the north were certain to bring a strain on the Government which would force it to seek support from the people. The King's demand for immediate submission, which reached Edinburgh with the significant comment of the Hampden judgment, at once gathered the whole body of remonstrants together round "the Tables" at Stirling; and a protestation, read at Edinburgh, was followed, on Archibald Johnston of Warriston's suggestion, by the renewal of the Covenant with God which had been drawn up and sworn to at a previous hour of peril, when Mary was still plotting against Protestantism, and Spain was preparing its Armada. "We promise and swear," ran the solemn engagement at its close, "by the great name of the Lord our God, to continue in the profession and obedience of the said Religion, and that we shall defend the same, and resist all their contrary errors and corruptions, according to our vocation and the utmost of that power which God has put into our hands all the days of our life." The Covenant was signed in the churchyard of the Grey Friars at Edinburgh, in a tumult of enthusiasm, "with such content and joy as those who,

The
Cove-
nant

1629
to
1640

having long before been outlaws and rebels, are admitted again into covenant with God." Gentlemen and nobles rode with the documents in their pockets over the country, gathering subscriptions to it, while the ministers pressed for a general consent to it from the pulpit. But pressure was needless. "Such was the zeal of subscribers that for a while many subscribed with tears on their cheeks;" some were indeed reputed to have "drawn their own blood and used it in place of ink to underwrite their names." The force given to Scottish freedom by this revival of religious fervour was seen in the new tone adopted by the Covenanters. The Marquis of Hamilton, who had come as Royal Commissioner to put an end to the quarrel, was at once met by demands for an abolition of the Court of High Commission, and withdrawal of the Books of Canons and Common Prayer, a free Parliament, and a free General Assembly. It was in vain that he threatened war; even the Council pressed Charles to give fuller satisfaction to the people. "I will rather die," the King wrote to Hamilton, "than yield to these impertinent and damnable demands;" but it was needful to gain time. "The discontents at home," wrote Lord Northumberland to Strafford, "do rather increase than lessen:" and Charles was without money or men. It was in vain that he begged for a loan from Spain on promise of declaring war against Holland, or that he tried to procure ten thousand troops from Flanders who might be useful in England after their victory over Scottish freedom. The loan and troops were both refused, and the contributions offered by the English Catholics did little to recruit the Exchequer. Charles had directed the Marquis to delay any decisive breach till the Royal fleet appeared in the Forth; but it was hard to equip a fleet at all. Scotland indeed was sooner ready for war than the King. The volunteers who had been serving in the Thirty Years' War streamed home at the call of their brethren. General Leslie, a veteran trained under Gustavus, came from Sweden to take the command of the new forces. A voluntary war tax was levied in every shire. The danger at last forced the King to yield to the Scotch demands; but he had no sooner yielded than the concession was withdrawn, and the Assembly hardly met before it was called upon to disperse. The order however was disregarded till it had abolished the innovations in worship and discipline, deposed the bishops, and formally set the Presbyterian Church courts up again. The news that Charles was gathering an army at York, and reckoning for support on the clans of the north, was answered by the seizure of Edinburgh, Dumbarton, and Stirling; while ten thousand well-equipped troops under Leslie and the Earl of Montrose seized Aberdeen, and brought the Catholic Earl of Huntly a prisoner to the south. Instead of overawing the country, the appearance of the Royal fleet in the Forth was the signal for Leslie's march on the Border. Charles had hardly pushed across the Tweed, when the "old little crooked soldier," encamping on the hill of Dunse Law, fairly offered him battle.

1639

Charles however was not strong enough to fight, and the two armies returned home on his consent to the gathering of a free Assembly and Parliament. But the pacification at Berwick was a mere suspension of arms; the King's summons of Wentworth, now created Earl of Strafford, from Ireland was a proof that violent measures were in preparation, and the Scots met the challenge by demands for the convocation of triennial Parliaments, or freedom of elections and of debate. Strafford counselled that they should be whipped back into their senses; and the discovery of a correspondence which was being carried on between some of the Covenanter leaders and the French Court raised hopes in the King that an appeal to the country for aid against "Scotch reason" would still find an answer in English loyalty. While Strafford hurried to Ireland to levy forces, Charles summoned what from its brief duration is known as the Short Parliament. The Houses met in a mood which gave hopes of an accommodation with the Crown, but all hope of bringing them into an attack on Scotland proved fruitless. The intercepted letters were quietly set aside, and the Commons declared as of old that redress of grievances must precede the grant of supplies. Even an offer to relinquish ship-money failed to draw Parliament from its resolve, and after three weeks' sitting it was roughly dissolved. "Things must go worse before they go better" was the cool comment of St. John, one of the patriot leaders. But the country was strangely moved. "So great a defection in the kingdom," wrote Lord Northumberland, "hath not been known in the memory of man." Strafford alone stood undaunted. He had returned from Ireland, where he had easily obtained money and men from his servile Parliament, to pour fresh vigour into the Royal counsels, and to urge that, by the refusal of the Parliament to supply the King's wants, Charles was freed from all rule of government, and entitled to supply himself at his will. The Earl was bent upon war, and took command of the Royal army, which again advanced to the north. But the Scots were already across the Border; forcing the passage of the Tyne in the face of an English detachment, they occupied Newcastle, and despatched from that town their proposals of peace. They prayed the King to consider their grievances, and, "with the advice and consent of the Estates of England convened in Parliament, to settle a firm and desirable peace." The prayer was backed by preparations for a march upon York, where Charles had already abandoned himself to despair. Behind him in fact England was all out in revolt. The London apprentices mobbed Laud at Lambeth, and broke up the sittings of the High Commission at St. Paul's. The war was denounced everywhere as "the Bishops' War," and the new levies murdered officers whom they suspected of Papistry, broke down altar-rails in every church they passed, and deserted to their homes. Even in the camp itself neither the threats nor prayers of Strafford could recall the troops to their duty, and he was forced to own that two months were required before they could

1629
to
1640

The
Bishops'
War

1640

be fit for the field. The success of the Scots emboldened two peers, Lord Wharton and Lord Howard, to present a petition for peace to the King himself; and though Strafford arrested and proposed to shoot them, the Council shrank from desperate courses. The threat of a Scotch advance forced Charles at last to give way, and after endeavouring to evade the necessity of convoking a Parliament by summoning a "Great Council of the Peers" at York, the general repudiation of his project drove him to summon the Houses once more to Westminster.

SECTION VI.—THE LONG PARLIAMENT, 1640—1644

[*Authorities.*—Clarendon, "History of the Rebellion" (edited Macray), is the most valuable authority for the period, despite the fact that it must be used with caution owing to the bias of the author; for its general character see the articles by Firth in the "English Historical Review," 1904, and the comments of Ranke in the appendix to his "History of England." Other sources, in addition to those already mentioned under previous sections, are May, "History of the Long Parliament"; the notes of proceedings by Verney (Camden Society), and the "Old Parliamentary History." Further details may be drawn from the Clarendon and Ormond Papers. Among modern works, Gardiner and Ranke are the most important; for Pym, see the "Dictionary of National Biography."]

Pym If Strafford embodied the spirit of tyranny, John Pym, the leader of the Commons from the first meeting of the new Houses at Westminster, stands out for all after time as the embodiment of law. A Somersetshire gentleman of good birth and competent fortune, he entered on public life in the Parliament of 1614, and was imprisoned for his patriotism at its close. He had been a leading member in that of 1620, and one of the "twelve ambassadors" for whom James ordered chairs to be set at Whitehall. Of the band of patriots with whom he had stood side by side in the constitutional struggle against the earlier despotism of Charles he was the sole survivor. Coke had died of old age; Cotton's heart was broken by oppression; Eliot had perished in the Tower; Wentworth had apostatized. Pym alone remained, resolute, patient as of old; and as the sense of his greatness grew silently during the eleven years of deepening tyranny, the hope and faith of better things clung almost passionately to the man who never doubted of the final triumph of freedom and the law. At their close, Clarendon tells us, in words all the more notable for their bitter tone of hate, "he was the most popular man, and the most able to do hurt, that have lived at any time." He had shown he knew how to wait, and when waiting was over he showed he knew how to act. On the eve of the Long Parliament he rode through England to quicken the electors to a sense of the crisis which had come at last; and on the assembling of the Commons he took his place, not merely as member for Tavistock, but as their acknow-

1640
to
1644

edged head. Few of the country gentlemen, indeed, who formed the bulk of the members, had sat in any previous House; and of the few, none represented in so eminent a way the Parliamentary tradition on which the coming struggle was to turn. Pym's eloquence, inferior in boldness and originality to that of Eliot or Wentworth, was better suited by its massive and logical force to convince and guide a great party; and it was backed by a calmness of temper, a dexterity and order in the management of public business, and a practical power of shaping the course of debate, which gave a form and method to Parliamentary proceedings such as they had never had before. Valuable, however, as these qualities were, it was a yet higher quality which raised Pym into the greatest, as he was the first, of Parliamentary leaders. Of the five hundred members who sate round him at St. Stephen's, he was the one man who had clearly foreseen, and as clearly resolved how to meet, the difficulties which lay before them. It was certain that Parliament would be drawn into a struggle with the Crown. It was probable that in such a struggle the House of Commons would be hampered, as it had been hampered before, by the House of Lords. The legal antiquarians of the older constitutional school stood helpless before such a conflict of co-ordinate powers, a conflict for which no provision had been made by the law, and on which precedents threw only a doubtful and conflicting light. But with a knowledge of precedent as great as their own, Pym rose high above them in his grasp of constitutional principles. He was the first English statesman who discovered, and applied to the political circumstances around him, what may be called the doctrine of constitutional proportion. He saw that as an element of constitutional life Parliament was of higher value than the Crown; he saw, too, that in Parliament itself the one essential part was the House of Commons. On these two facts he based his whole policy in the contest which followed. When Charles refused to act with the Parliament, Pym treated the refusal as a temporary abdication on the part of the sovereign, which vested the executive power in the two Houses, until new arrangements were made. When the Lords obstructed public business, he warned them that obstruction would only force the Commons "to save the kingdom alone." Revolutionary as these principles seemed at the time, they have both been recognized as bases of our constitution since the days of Pym. The first principle was established by the Convention and Parliament which followed on the departure of James the Second; the second by the acknowledgement on all sides since the Reform Bill of 1832 that the government of the country is really in the hands of the House of Commons, and can only be carried on by ministers who represent the majority of that House. Pym's temper, indeed, was the very opposite of the temper of a revolutionist. Few natures have ever been wider in their range of sympathy or action. Serious as his purpose was, his manners were genial, and even courtly: he turned easily from an invective

1640
to
1644

against Strafford to a chat with Lady Carlisle; and the grace and gaiety of his social tone, even when the care and weight of public affairs were bringing him to his grave, gave rise to a hundred silly scandals among the prurient Royalists. It was this striking combination of genial versatility with a massive force in his nature which marked him out from the first moment of power as a born ruler of men. He proved himself at once the subtlest of diplomatists and the grandest of demagogues. He was equally at home in tracking the subtle intricacies of the Army Plot, or in kindling popular passion with words of fire. Though past middle life when his work really began, for he was born in 1584, four years before the coming of the Armada, he displayed from the first meeting of the Long Parliament the qualities of a great administrator, an immense faculty for labour, a genius for organization, patience, tact, a power of inspiring confidence in all whom he touched, calmness and moderation under good fortune or ill, an immovable courage, an iron will. No English ruler has ever shown greater nobleness of natural temper or a wider capacity for government than the Somersetshire squire whom his enemies, made clear-sighted by their hate, greeted truly enough as "King Pym."

The
work
of the
Parliament

His ride over England on the eve of the elections had been hardly needed, for the summons of a Parliament at once woke the kingdom to a fresh life. The Puritan emigration to New England was suddenly and utterly suspended; "the change," said Winthrop, "made all men to stay in England in expectation of a new world." The public discontent spoke from every Puritan pulpit, and expressed itself in a sudden burst of pamphlets, the first-fruits of the thirty thousand which were issued before the Restoration, and which turned England at large into a school of political discussion. The resolute looks of the members as they gathered at Westminster contrasted with the hesitating words of the King, and each brought from borough or county a petition of grievances. Fresh petitions were brought every day by bands of citizens or farmers. Forty committees were appointed to examine and report on them, and their reports formed the grounds on which the Commons acted. One by one the illegal acts of the Tyranny were annulled. Prynne and his fellow "martyrs," recalled from their prisons, entered London in triumph amidst the shouts of a great multitude who strewed laurel in their path. The civil and criminal jurisdiction of the Privy Council, the Star Chamber, the court of High Commission, the irregular jurisdictions of the Council of the North, of the Duchy of Lancaster, the County of Chester, and a crowd of lesser tribunals were summarily abolished. Ship-money was declared illegal, and the judgment in Hampden's case annulled. A statute declaring "the ancient right of the subjects of this kingdom that no subsidy, custom, import, or any charge whatsoever, ought or may be laid or imposed upon any merchandize exported or imported by subjects, denizens, or aliens, without common consent in Parliament," put an end for ever to all pre-

tensions to a right of arbitrary taxation on the part of the Crown. A Triennial Bill enforced the assembly of the Houses every three years and bound the returning officers to proceed to election if the Royal writ failed to summon them. Charles protested, but gave way. He was forced to look helplessly on at the wreck of his Tyranny, for the Scotch army was still encamped in the north; and the Parliament, which saw in the presence of the Scots a security against its own dissolution, was in no hurry to vote the money necessary for their withdrawal. "We cannot do without them," Strode honestly confessed, "the Philistines are still too strong for us." Meanwhile the Commons were dealing roughly with the agents of the Royal system. In every county a list of the Royal officers, under the name of "delinquents," was ordered to be prepared and laid before the Houses. Windebank, the Secretary of State, with the Chancellor, Finch, fled in terror over sea. Laud himself was flung into prison. The shadow perhaps of what was to come falls across the pages of his Diary, and softens the hard temper of the man into a strange tenderness. "I stayed at Lambeth till the evening," writes the Archbishop, "to avoid the gaze of the people. I went to evening prayer in my chapel. The Psalms of the day, and chapter fifty of Isaiah, gave me great comfort. God make me worthy of it and fit to receive it. As I went to my barge hundreds of my poor neighbours stood there, and prayed for my safety and return to my house. For which I bless God and them."

1640
1641
1644

But even Laud, hateful as he was to all but the poor neighbours whose prayers his alms had won, was not the centre of so great and universal a hatred as the Earl of Strafford. Strafford's guilt was more than the guilt of a servile instrument of tyranny, it was the guilt of "that grand apostate to the Commonwealth who," in the terrible words which closed Lord Digby's invective, "must not expect to be pardoned in this world till he be despatched to the other." He was conscious of his danger, but Charles forced him to attend the Court; and with characteristic boldness he resolved to anticipate attack by charging the Parliamentary leaders with a treasonable correspondence with the Scots. He was just laying his scheme before Charles when the news reached him that Pym was at the bar of the Lords with his impeachment for High Treason. "With speed," writes an eye-witness, "he comes to the House: he calls rudely at the door," and, "with a proud glooming look, makes towards his place at the board-head. But at once many bid him void the House, so he is forced in confusion to go to the door till he was called." He was only recalled to hear his committal to the Tower. He was still resolute to retort the charge of treason on his foes, and "offered to speak, but was commanded to be gone without a word." The keeper of the Black rod demanded his sword as he took him in charge. "This done, he makes through a number of people towards his coach, no man capping to him, before whom that morning the greatest of all England would have stood

The
Death of
Strafford

1640
to
1644

uncovered." The effect of the blow was seen in the cessation on the King's part of his old tone of command, and in the attempt he made to construct a ministry from among the patriots, with Lord Bedford at their head, on condition that Strafford's life should be spared. But the price was too high to pay; the negotiations were interrupted by Bedford's death, and by the discovery that Charles had been listening all the while to a knot of adventurers who proposed to bring about his end by stirring the army to an attack on the Parliament. The discovery of the Army Plot sealed Strafford's fate. The trial of his Impeachment began in Westminster Hall, and the whole of the House of Commons appeared to support it. The passion which the cause excited was seen in the loud cries of sympathy or hatred which burst from the crowded benches on either side. For fifteen days Strafford struggled with a remarkable courage and ingenuity against the list of charges, and he had melted his audience to tears by the pathos of his defence when the trial was suddenly interrupted. Though tyranny and misgovernment had been conclusively proved against him, the technical proof of treason was weak. "The law of England," to use Hallam's words, "is silent as to conspiracies against itself," and treason by the Statute of Edward the Third was restricted to a levying of war against the King or a compassing of his death. The Commons endeavoured to strengthen their case by bringing forward the notes of a meeting of the Council in which Strafford had urged the use of his Irish troops "to reduce this kingdom to obedience;" but the words were still technically doubtful, and the Lords would only admit the evidence on condition of wholly reopening the case. Pym and Hampden remained convinced of the sufficiency of the impeachment; but the House broke loose from their control, and, guided by St. John and Lord Falkland, resolved to abandon these judicial proceedings, and fall back on the resource of a Bill of Attainder. Their course has been bitterly censured by some whose opinion in such a matter is entitled to respect. But the crime of Strafford was none the less a crime that it did not fall within the scope of the Statute of Treasons. It is impossible indeed to provide for some of the greatest dangers which can happen to national freedom by any formal statute. Even now a minister might avail himself of the temper of a Parliament elected in some moment of popular panic, and, though the nation returned to its senses, might simply by refusing to appeal to the country govern in defiance of its will. Such a course would be technically legal, but such a minister would be none the less a criminal. Strafford's course, whether it fell within the Statute of Treasons or no, was from beginning to end an attack on the freedom of the whole nation. In the last resort a nation retains the right of self-defence, and the Bill of Attainder is the assertion of such a right for the punishment of a public enemy who falls within the scope of no written law. The chance of the offender's escape roused the Londoners to frenzy, and crowds surrounded the Houses, with cries of "Justice," while

the Lords passed the Bill. The Earl's one hope was in the King, but three days later the royal sanction was given, and he passed to his doom. Strafford died as he had lived. His friends warned him of the vast multitude gathered before the Tower to witness his fall. "I know how to look death in the face, and the people too," he answered proudly. "I thank God I am no more afraid of death, but as cheerfully put off my doublet at this time as ever I did when I went to bed." As the axe fell, the silence of the great multitude was broken by a universal shout of joy. The streets blazed with bonfires. The bells clashed out from every steeple. "Many," says an observer, "that came to town to see the execution rode in triumph back, waving their hats, and with all expressions of joy through every town they went, crying, 'His head is off! His head is off!'"

1640
to
1644

May,
1641

Great as were the changes which had been wrought in the first six months of the Long Parliament, they had been based strictly on precedent, and had, in fact, been simply a restoration of the older English constitution as it existed at the close of the Wars of the Roses. But every day made it harder to remain quietly in this position. On the one hand, the air, since the army conspiracy, was full of rumours and panic; the creak of a few boards revived the memory of the Gunpowder Plot, and the members rushed out of the House of Commons in the full belief that it was undermined. On the other hand, Charles regarded his consent to the new measures as having been extorted by force, and to be retracted at the first opportunity. Both Houses, in their terror, swore to defend the Protestant religion and the public liberties, an oath which was subsequently exacted from every one engaged in civil employment, and voluntarily taken by the great mass of the people. The same terror of a counter-revolution induced Hyde and the "moderate men" in the Commons to bring in a bill providing that the present Parliament should not be dissolved but by its own consent. Charles signed the bill without protest, but he was already seeking aid from France, and preparing for the counter-revolution it was meant to meet. Hitherto, the Scotch army had held him down, but its payment and withdrawal could no longer be delayed, and it was no sooner on its way homeward than the King resolved to prevent its return. In spite of prayers from the Parliament he left London for Edinburgh, yielded to every demand of the Assembly and the Scotch Estates, attended the Presbyterian worship, lavished titles and favours on the Earl of Argyle and the patriot leaders, and gained for a few months a popularity which spread dismay in the English Parliament. Their dread of his designs was increased when he was found to have been intriguing all the while with the Earl of Montrose—who had seceded from the patriot party before his coming, and been rewarded for his secession with imprisonment in the castle of Edinburgh—and when Hamilton and Argyle withdrew suddenly from the capital, and charged the King with a treacherous plot

The
Grand
Remon-
strance

1640
to
1644

October,
1641

to seize and carry them out of the realm. The popular fright was fanned to frenzy by news which came suddenly from Ireland where the fall of Strafford had put an end to all semblance of rule. The disbanded soldiers of the army he had raised spread over the country, and stirred the smouldering disaffection into a flame. A conspiracy, organized with wonderful power and secrecy, burst forth in Ulster, where the confiscation of the Settlement had never been forgiven, and spread like wildfire over the centre and west of the island. Dublin was saved by a mere chance; but in the open country the work of murder went on unchecked. Fifty thousand English people perished in a few days, and rumour doubled and trebled the number. Tales of horror and outrage, such as maddened our own England when they reached us from Cawnpore, came day after day over the Irish Channel. Sworn depositions told how husbands were cut to pieces in presence of their wives, their children's brains dashed out before their faces, their daughters brutally violated and driven out naked to perish frozen in the woods. "Some," says May, "were burned on set purpose, others drowned for sport or pastime, and if they swam kept from landing with poles, or shot, or murdered in the water; many were buried quick, and some set into the earth breast-high and there left to famish." The new feature of the revolt, beside the massacre with which it opened, was its religious character. It was no longer a struggle, as of old, of Celt against Saxon, but of Catholic against Protestant. The Papists within the Pale joined hands in it with the wild kernes outside the Pale. The rebels called themselves "Confederate Catholics," resolved to defend "the public and free exercise of the true and Catholic Roman religion." The panic waxed greater when it was found that they claimed to be acting by the King's commission, and in aid of his authority. They professed to stand by Charles and his heirs against all that should "directly and indirectly endeavour to suppress their Royal prerogatives." They showed a Commission, purporting to have been issued by Royal command at Edinburgh, and styled themselves "the King's army." The Commission was a forgery, but belief in it was quickened by the want of all sympathy with the national honour which Charles displayed. To him the revolt seemed a useful check on his opponents. "I hope," he wrote coolly, when the news reached him, "this ill news of Ireland may hinder some of these follies in England." Above all, it would necessitate the raising of an army, and with an army at his command he would again be the master of the Parliament. The Parliament, on the other hand, saw in the Irish revolt the disclosure of a vast scheme for a counter-revolution, of which the withdrawal of the Scotch army, the reconciliation of Scotland, the intrigues at Edinburgh, the exultation of the royalists at the King's return, and the appearance of a royalist party in the House itself, were all parts. At the head of the new party stood Lord Falkland, a man learned and accomplished, the centre of a circle which embraced the most liberal thinkers of his day, a keen

reasoner and able speaker, whose convictions still went with the Parliament, while his wavering and impulsive temper, his love of the Church, which was now being threatened, his passionate longings for peace, his sympathy for the fallen, led him to struggle for a King whom he distrusted, and to die in a cause that was not his own. Behind him clustered intriguers like Hyde, chivalrous soldiers like Sir Edmund Verney ("I have eaten the King's bread and served him now thirty years, and I will not do so base a thing as to distrust him"), men frightened at the rapid march of change, or by the dangers which threatened Episcopacy. With a broken Parliament, and perils gathering without, Pym resolved to appeal for aid to the nation itself. The Solemn Remonstrance which he laid before the House was a detailed narrative of the work which the Parliament had done, the difficulties it had surmounted, and the new dangers which lay in its path. The Parliament had been charged with a design to abolish Episcopacy, it declared its purpose to be simply that of reducing the power of Bishops. Politically it repudiated the taunt of revolutionary aims. It demanded only the observance of the existing laws against Papistry, securities for the due administration of justice, and the employment of ministers who possessed the confidence of Parliament. The new King's party fought fiercely, debate followed debate, the sittings were prolonged till, for the first time in the history of the House, lights had to be brought in; and it was only at midnight, and by a majority of eleven, that the Remonstrance was finally adopted, after a scene of unexampled violence. On an attempt of the minority to offer a formal protest the slumbering passion burst into a flame. "Some waved their hats over their heads, and others took their swords in their scabbards out of their belts, and held them by the pommels in their hands, setting the lower part on the ground." Only Hampden's coolness and tact averted a conflict. The Remonstrance was felt on both sides to be a crisis in the struggle. "Had it been rejected," said Cromwell, as he left the House, "I would have sold to-morrow all I possess, and left England for ever." Listened to sullenly by the King, it kindled afresh the spirit of the country: London swore to live and die with the Parliament; associations were formed in every county for the defence of the Houses; and when the guard which Lord Essex had given them was withdrawn by the King, the populace crowded down to Westminster to take its place.

The question which had above all broken the unity of the Parliament had been the question of the Church. All were agreed on the necessity of its reform, for the Laudian party of High Churchmen were rendered powerless by the course of events; and one of the first acts of the Parliament had been to appoint a Committee of Religion for this purpose. Within, as without the House, the general opinion was in favour of a reduction of the power and wealth of the Church, without any radical change in its constitution. Even among the bishops themselves, the more prominent saw the need

1640
to
1644

Nov.
1641

Arrest
of the
Five
Members

1640
to
1644

for consenting to the abolition of Chapters and Bishops' Courts, as well as to the creation of a council of ministers in each diocese, which had been suggested by Archbishop Usher as a check on episcopal autocracy. A scheme to this effect was drawn up by Bishop Williams of Lincoln; but it was far from meeting the wishes of the general body of the Commons. Pym and Lord Falkland demanded, in addition to these changes, a severance of the clergy from all secular or state offices, and an expulsion of the bishops from the House of Lords. The last demand was backed by a petition from seven hundred ministers of the Church; but the strife between the two sections of episcopal reformers gave strength to the growing party who demanded the abolition of Episcopacy altogether. The doctrines of Cartwright had risen into popularity under the persecution of Laud, and Presbyterianism was now a formidable force among the middle classes. Its chief strength lay in the eastern counties and in London, where a few ministers such as Calamy and Marshall had formed a committee for its diffusion; while in Parliament it was represented by Lord Brooke, Lord Mandeville, and Lord Saye and Sele. In the Commons Sir Harry Vane represented a more extreme party of reformers, the Independents of the future, whose sentiments were little less hostile to Presbyterianism than to Episcopacy, but who acted with the Presbyterians for the present, and formed a part of what became known as the "Root and Branch party," from its demand for the extirpation of prelacy. The attitude of Scotland in the great struggle with tyranny, and the political advantage of a religious union between the two kingdoms, as well as the desire to knit the English Church more closely to the general body of Protestantism, gave fresh force to the Presbyterian scheme. Milton, who after the composition of his "Lycidas," had spent a year in foreign travel, but had been called home from Italy by the opening of the Parliament, threw himself hotly into the theological strife. He held it "an unjust thing that the English should differ from all Churches as many as be reformed." In spite of this pressure however, and of a Petition from London with fifteen thousand signatures to the same purport, the Committee of Religion reported in favour of the moderate reforms suggested by Falkland and Pym; and the first of these was embodied by the former in a bill for the expulsion of bishops from the House of Peers, which passed the Commons almost unanimously. Rejected by the Lords on the eve of the King's journey to Scotland, it was again introduced on his return; but, in spite of violent remonstrances from the Commons, the bill still hung fire among the Peers. The delay roused the excited crowd of Londoners who gathered round Whitehall; the bishops' carriages were stopped; and the prelates themselves rabbled on their way to the House. The angry pride of Williams induced ten of his fellow bishops to declare themselves prevented from attendance in Parliament, and to protest against all acts done in their absence as null and void. The Protest was met at once on the

part of the Peers by the committal of the prelates who had signed it to the Tower. But the contest gave a powerful aid to the projects of the King. The courtiers declared openly that the rabbling of the bishops proved that there was "no free Parliament," and strove to bring about fresh outrages by gathering troops of officers and soldiers of fortune, who were seeking for employment in the Irish war, and pitting them against the crowds at Whitehall. The brawls of the two parties, who gave each other the nicknames of "Round-heads" and "Cavaliers," created fresh alarm in the Parliament; but Charles persisted in refusing it a guard. "On the honour of a King," he engaged to defend them from violence as completely as his own children, but the answer had hardly been given when his Attorney appeared at the bar of the Lords, and accused Hampden, Pym, Hollis, Strode, and Haselrig of high treason in their correspondence with the Scots. A herald-at-arms appeared at the bar of the Commons, and demanded the surrender of the five members. All constitutional law was set aside by a charge which proceeded personally from the King, which deprived the accused of their legal right to a trial by their peers, and summoned them before a tribunal which had no pretence to a jurisdiction over them. The Commons simply promised to take the demand into consideration, and again requested a guard. "I will reply to-morrow," said the King. On the morrow he summoned three hundred gentlemen to follow him, and, embracing the Queen, promised her that in an hour he would return master of his kingdom. A mob of Cavaliers joined him as he left the palace, and remained in Westminster Hall as Charles, accompanied by his nephew, the Elector-Palatine, entered the House of Commons. "Mr. Speaker," he said, "I must for a time borrow your chair!" He paused with a sudden confusion as his eye fell on the vacant spot where Pym commonly sate: for at the news of his approach the House had ordered the five members to withdraw. "Gentlemen," he began in slow broken sentences, "I am sorry for this occasion of coming unto you. Yesterday I sent a Sergeant-at-arms upon a very important occasion, to apprehend some that by my command were accused of high treason, whereunto I did expect obedience, and not a message." Treason, he went on, had no privilege, "and therefore I am come to know if any of these persons that were accused are here." There was a dead silence, only broken by his reiterated "I must have them wheresoever I find them." He again paused, but the stillness was unbroken. Then he called out, "Is Mr. Pym here?" There was no answer; and Charles, turning to the Speaker, asked him whether the five members were there. Lenthall fell on his knees, and replied that he had neither eyes nor tongue to see or say anything save what the House commanded him. "Well, well," Charles angrily retorted, "'tis no matter. I think my eyes are as good as another's!" There was another long pause, while he looked carefully over the ranks of members. "I see," he said at last, "my birds are flown,

1640
to
1644

Jan 4,
1642

1640 but I do expect you will send them to me." If they did not, he
to added, he would seek them himself; and with a closing protest
1644 that he never intended any force, "he went out of the House,"
says an eye-witness, "in a more discontented and angry passion
than he came in."

The Eve
of the
War

Nothing but the absence of the five members, and the calm dignity of the Commons, had prevented the King's outrage from ending in bloodshed. "It was believed," says Whitelocke, who was present at the scene, "that if the King had found them there, and called in his guards to have seized them, the members of the House would have endeavoured the defence of them, which might have proved a very unhappy and sad business." Five hundred gentlemen of the best blood in England would hardly have stood tamely by while the bravoes of Whitehall laid hands on their leaders in the midst of the Parliament. But Charles was blind to the danger of his new course. The five members had taken refuge in the city, and it was there that on the next day the King himself demanded their surrender from the aldermen at Guildhall. Cries of "Privilege" rang round him as he returned through the streets: the writs issued for the arrest of the five were disregarded by the Sheriffs, and a proclamation issued four days later, declaring them traitors, was answered by their triumphant return to St. Stephen's. The Trained Bands of London and Southwark were on foot, and the London watermen, sworn "to guard the Parliament, the Kingdom, and the King," escorted the five members as they passed along the river to Westminster. Terror drove the Cavaliers from Whitehall, and Charles stood absolutely alone; for the outrage had severed him for the moment from his new friends in the Parliament, and from the ministers, Falkland and Colepepper, whom he had chosen among them. But lonely as he was, Charles had resolved on war. The Earl of Newcastle was despatched to muster a Royal force in the north; and as the five members re-entered the House, Charles withdrew from Whitehall. Both sides prepared for the coming struggle. The Queen sailed from Dover with the crown jewels to buy munitions of war. The Cavaliers again gathered round the King, and the Royalist press flooded the country with State papers drawn up by Hyde. On the other hand, mounted processions of freeholders from Buckinghamshire and Kent traversed London on their way to St. Stephen's, vowing to live and die with the Parliament. The Tower was blockaded, and the two great arsenals, Portsmouth and Hull, secured by Pym's forethought. The Lords were scared out of their policy of obstruction by his bold announcement of the new position taken by the House of Commons. "The Commons," said their leader, "will be glad to have your concurrence and help in saving the kingdom; but if they fail of it, it should not discourage them in doing their duty. And whether the kingdom be lost or saved, they shall be sorry that the story of this present Parliament should tell posterity that in so great a danger and extremity the House of Commons

Jan. 10

should be enforced to save the kingdom alone." The effect of Pym's words was seen in the passing of the bill for excluding bishops from the House of Lords. The great point, however, was to secure armed support from the nation at large, and here both sides were in a difficulty. Previous to the innovations introduced by the Tudors, and which had been taken away by the bill against pressing soldiers, the King in himself had no power of calling on his subjects generally to bear arms, save for purposes of restoring order or meeting foreign invasion. On the other hand, no one contended that such a power had ever been exercised by the two Houses without the King; and Charles steadily refused to consent to the Militia bill, in which the command of the national force was given in every county to men devoted to the Parliamentary cause. Both parties therefore broke through constitutional precedent, the Parliament in appointing Lord Lieutenants of the Militia by ordinance of the two Houses, Charles in levying forces by Royal commissions of array. The King's great difficulty lay in procuring arms, and at the end of April he suddenly appeared before Hull, the magazine of the north, and demanded admission. The new governor, Sir John Hotham, fell on his knees, but refused to open the gates: and the avowal of his act by the Parliament was followed by the withdrawal of the new Royalist party among its members from their seats at Westminster. Falkland, Colepepper, and Hyde, with thirty-two peers and sixty members of the House of Commons, joined Charles at York; and Lyttelton, the Lord Keeper, followed with the Great Seal. But the King's warlike projects were still checked by the general opposition of the country. A great meeting of the Yorkshire freeholders which he convened on Heyworth Moor ended in a petition praying him to be reconciled to the Parliament, and in spite of gifts of plate from the Universities and nobles of his party arms and money were still wanting for his new levies. The two Houses, on the other hand, gained in unity and vigour by the withdrawal of the Royalists. The Militia was rapidly enrolled, Lord Warwick named to the command of the fleet, and a loan opened in the city to which the women brought even their wedding rings. The tone of the two Houses had risen with the threat of force: and their last proposals demanded the powers of appointing and dismissing the Royal ministers, naming guardians for the Royal children, and of virtually controlling military, civil, and religious affairs. "If I granted your demands," replied Charles, "I should be no more than the mere phantom of a king."

1643
to
1644

The most probable estimate of the number of victims in the Irish "massacre" is some five thousand, though many more perished later by indirect means; see Gardiner, "History of England," and Lecky, "History of England." The most moderate contemporary estimate placed the number at 37,000. Commissions of array had been used to raise men for foreign service under Edward I. and other kings. This was declared illegal by various statutes. Commissions of array to raise men

1642 for home defence, or on the excuse of danger of invasion, had been used
to by the Tudors, and their issue was regarded by them as a royal prerogative;
1646 for the popular idea of the right of impressment for the army, see
"Henry IV.," Part I., Act IV., Scene 2. A statute of Charles I., however,
had declared it to be illegal to impress men except to repel invasion,
unless they were bound to serve by tenure.

SECTION VII.—THE CIVIL WAR, JULY 1642—AUGUST 1646

[*Authorities.*—Clarendon's "History" is the main authority. See also Ludlow's "Memoirs" (edited Firth); Mrs. Hutchinson's memoirs of her husband, Colonel Hutchinson (edited Firth); the Clarke Papers (edited Firth); the "Diary of Sir Henry Slingsby" for the views of an ordinary cavalier; and the "Memoirs of Captain Hodgson" for those of an ordinary Puritan. For Cromwell, see Carlyle's "Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell," and Firth, "Cromwell." Various collections of contemporary pamphlets have been printed, *e.g.*, those in the "Harleian Miscellany" and the "Somers Tracts"; see also Mascher, "Select Tracts Relating to the Civil Wars." For the army, Firth, "Cromwell's Army." For Fairfax, see Sprigge, "Angha Rediviva," an account of the operations of the New Model by Fairfax's chaplain; the "Fairfax Correspondence"; and Clements Markham, "Life of Fairfax." For parliamentary proceedings, in addition to the sources already mentioned, Vicars, "England's Parliamentary Chronicle." Also of value are the various papers connected with the Verney Family; *i.e.*, "Memoirs of the Verney Family," the "Verney Papers" (Camden Society), and "Verney's Notes of the Long Parliament" (Camden Society). For Montrose, Napier, "Memoirs of the Marquis of Montrose.")

Edgehill The breaking off of negotiations was followed on both sides by preparations for immediate war. Hampden, Pym, and Hollis, became the guiding spirits of a Committee of Public Safety which was created by Parliament as its administrative organ; English and Scotch officers were drawn from the Low Countries, and Lord Essex named commander of an army of twenty thousand foot and four thousand horse. The confidence on the Parliamentary side was great; "we all thought one battle would decide," Baxter confessed after the first encounter; for the King was almost destitute of money and arms, and in spite of his strenuous efforts to raise recruits he was embarrassed by the reluctance of his own adherents to begin the struggle. Resolved, however, to force on a contest, he raised the Royal Standard at Nottingham "on the evening of a very stormy and tempestuous day," but the country made no answer to his appeal; while Essex, who had quitted London amidst the shouts of a great multitude, with orders from the Parliament to follow the King, "and by battle or other way rescue him from his perfidious councillors and restore him to Parliament," mustered his army at Northampton. Charles had but a handful of men, and the dash of a few regiments of horse would have ended the war; but Essex shrank from a decisive stroke, and trusted to reduce Charles to submission by a show of force. No sooner, however, had the King fallen back on Shrewsbury than the whole face of affairs suddenly changed. Catholics and

Royalists rallied fast to his standard, and a bold march on London drew Essex from his inactivity at Worcester to protect the capital. The two armies fell in with one another on the field of Edgehill, near Banbury. The encounter was a surprise, and the battle which followed was little more than a confused combat of horse. At its outset the desertion of Sir Faithful Fortescue, with a whole regiment, threw the Parliamentary forces into disorder, while the Royalist horse on either wing drove their opponents from the field; but the reserve of Lord Essex broke the Royalist foot, which formed the centre of the King's line, and though his nephew, Prince Rupert, brought back his squadrons in time to save Charles from capture or flight, the night fell on a drawn battle. The moral advantage, however, rested with the King. Essex had learned that his troopers were no match for the Cavaliers, and his withdrawal to Warwick left open the road to the capital. Rupert pressed for an instant march on London, but the proposal found stubborn opponents among the moderate Royalists, who dreaded the complete triumph of Charles as much as his defeat. The King therefore paused for the time at Oxford, where he was received with uproarious welcome; and when the cowardice of its garrison delivered Reading to Rupert's horse, and his daring capture of Brentford drew the Royal army in his support almost to the walls of the capital, the panic of the Londoners was already over, and the junction of their trainbands with the army of Essex forced Charles to fall back again on his old quarters. But though the Parliament rallied quickly from the blow of Edgehill, the war, as its area widened through the winter, went steadily for the King. The fortification of Oxford gave him a firm hold on the midland counties; while the balance of the two parties in the north was overthrown by the march of the Earl of Newcastle, with the force he had raised in Northumberland, upon York. Lord Fairfax, the Parliamentary leader in that county, was thrown back on the manufacturing towns of the West Riding, where Puritanism found its stronghold; and the arrival of the Queen with arms from Holland encouraged the Royal army to push its scouts across the Trent, and threaten the eastern counties, which held firmly for the Parliament. The stress of the war was shown by the vigorous exertions of the two Houses. The negotiations which had gone on into the spring were broken off by the old demand that the King should return to his Parliament; London was fortified; and a tax of two millions a year was laid on the districts which adhered to the Parliamentary cause. Essex, whose army had been freshly equipped, was ordered to advance upon Oxford; but though the King held himself ready to fall back on the west, the Earl shrank from again risking his raw army in an encounter. He confined himself to the recapture of Reading, and so a month of idle encampment round Brill, while disease thinned his ranks and the Royalists beat up his quarters.

While Essex lingered and manœuvred, Charles boldly detached part of his small force at Oxford to strengthen a Royalist rising

1642
to
1646
—
Oct. 23

1643

1642
to
1646

—
The
Cornish
rising

May,
1643

July,
1643

in the west. Nowhere was the Royal cause to take so brave or noble a form as among the Cornishmen. Cornwall stood apart from the general life of England: cut off from it not only by differences of blood and speech, but by the feudal tendencies of its people, who clung with a Celtic loyalty to their local chieftains, and suffered their fidelity to the Crown to determine their own. They had as yet done little more than keep the war out of their own county; but the march of a small Parliamentary force under Lord Stamford upon Launceston forced them into action. A little band of Cornishmen gathered round the chivalrous Sir Bevil Greenvil, "so destitute of provisions that the best officers had but a biscuit a day," and with only a handful of powder for the whole force; but starving and outnumbered as they were, they scaled the steep rise of Stratton Hill, sword in hand, and drove Stamford back on Exeter, with a loss of two thousand men, his ordnance and baggage train. Sir Ralph Hopton, the best of the Royalist generals, took the command of their army as it advanced into Somerset, and drew the stress of the war into the west. Essex despatched a picked force under Sir William Waller to check their advance; but Somerset was already lost ere he reached Bath, and the Cornishmen stormed his strong position on Lansdowne Hill in the teeth of his guns. But the stubborn fight robbed the victors of their leaders; Hopton was wounded, Greenvil slain, and with them fell the two heroes of the little army, Sir Nicholas Slanning and Sir John Trevanion, "both young, neither of them above eight and twenty, of entire friendship to one another, and to Sir Bevil Greenvil." Waller, beaten as he was, hung on their weakened force as it moved for aid upon Oxford, and succeeded in cooping up the foot in Devizes. But the horse broke through, and joining an army which had been sent to their relief under Wilmot, afterwards Lord Rochester, turned back, and dashed Waller's army to pieces in a fresh victory on Roundway Down. The Cornish rising seemed to have turned the tide of the war. Strengthened by their earlier successes, and by the succours which his Queen brought from the north, Charles had already prepared to advance, when Rupert, in a daring raid upon Wycombe, met a party of Parliamentary horse, with Hampden at its head, on Chalgrove field. The skirmish ended in the success of the Royalists, and Hampden was seen riding off the field "before the action was done, which he never used to do, and with his head hanging down, and resting his hands upon the neck of his horse." He was mortally wounded, and his death seemed an omen of the ruin of the cause he loved. Disaster followed disaster. Essex, more and more anxious for a peace, fell back on Uxbridge; while a cowardly surrender of Bristol to Prince Rupert gave Charles the second city of the kingdom, and the mastery of the west. The news fell on the Parliament "like a sentence of death." The Lords debated nothing but proposals of peace. London itself was divided; "a great multitude of the wives of substantial citizens" clamoured at the door of the Commons for

peace; and a flight of six of the few peers who remained at Westminster to the camp at Oxford proved the general despair of the Parliament's success. 1642
to
1646

From this moment, however, the firmness of the Parliamentary leaders began slowly to reverse the fortunes of the war. Waller was received on his return from Roundway Hill "as if he had brought the King prisoner with him." A new army was placed under the command of Lord Manchester to check the progress of Newcastle. In the west, indeed, things still went badly. Prince Maurice continued Rupert's career of success, and the conquest of Barnstaple and Exeter secured Devon for the King. Gloucester alone interrupted the communications between his forces in Bristol and in the north; and Charles moved against the city, with hope of a speedy surrender. But the gallant resistance of the town called Essex to its relief. It was reduced to a single barrel of powder when the Earl's approach forced Charles to raise the siege; and the Puritan army fell steadily back again on London, after an indecisive engagement near Newbury, in which Lord Falkland fell, "ingeminating 'Peace, peace!'" and the London trainbands flung Rupert's horsemen roughly off their front of pikes. In this posture of his affairs nothing but a great victory could have saved the King, for the day which witnessed the triumphant return of Essex witnessed the solemn taking of the Covenant. The
Cove-
nant

Pym had resolved, at last, to fling the Scotch sword into the wavering balance; and in the darkest hour of the Parliament's cause Sir Harry Vane had been despatched to Edinburgh to arrange the terms on which the aid of Scotland would be given. First amongst them stood the demand of a "unity in Religion;" an adoption, in other words, of the Presbyterian system by the Church of England. Aug.
1643

Events had moved so rapidly since the earlier debates on Church government in the Commons that some arrangement of this kind had become a necessity. The bishops to a man, and the bulk of the clergy whose bent was purely episcopal, had joined the Royal cause, and were being expelled from their livings as "delinquents." Some new system of Church government was imperatively called for by the religious necessities of the country; and, though Pym and the leading statesmen were still in opinion moderate Episcopalian, the growing force of Presbyterianism, as well as the needs of the war, forced them to seek such a system in the adoption of the Scotch discipline. Scotland, for its part, saw that the triumph of the Parliament was necessary for its own security; and whatever difficulties stood in the way of Vane's wary and rapid negotiations were removed by the policy of the King. While the Parliament looked for aid to the north, Charles had long been seeking assistance from the Irish rebels. The Massacre had left them the objects of a vengeful hate such as England had hardly known before, but with Charles they were simply counters in his game of king-craft. The conclusion of a truce with them left the army under Lord Ormoud, which had hitherto held their revolt in

Sep. 25,
1643

1642
to
1648

check, at the King's disposal for service in England; and at the same moment he secured a force of Irish Catholics to support by their landing in Argyleshire a rising of the Highlands under Montrose, which aimed at the overthrow of the government at Edinburgh. None of the King's schemes proved so fatal to his cause as these. On their discovery officer after officer in his own army flung down their commissions, the peers who had fled to Oxford fled back again to London, and the Royalist reaction in the Parliament itself came utterly to an end. Scotland, anxious for its own safety, hastened to sign the Covenant; and the Commons, "with uplifted hands," swore in St. Margaret's church to observe it. They pledged themselves to "bring the Churches of God in the three Kingdoms to the nearest conjunction and uniformity in religion, confession of faith, form of Church government, direction for worship, and catechizing; that we, and our posterity after us, may as brethren live in faith and love, and the Lord may delight to live in the midst of us:" to extirpate Popery, prelacy, superstition, schism, and profaneness; to "preserve the rights and privileges of the Parliament, and the liberties of the Kingdom;" to punish malignants and opponents of reformation in Church and State; to "unite the two Kingdoms in a firm peace and union to all posterity." The Covenant ended with a solemn acknowledgment of national sin, and a vow of reformation. "Our true, unfeigned purpose, desire, and endeavour for ourselves and all others under our power and charge, both in public and private, in all duties we owe to God and man, is to amend our lives, and each one to go before another in the example of a real reformation."

Marston
Moor

The conclusion of the Covenant had been the last work of Pym, but it was only a part of the great plan which he had formed, and which was carried out by the "Committee of the Two Kingdoms," entrusted after his death (Dec. 1643) with the conduct of the war, and of foreign affairs. Three strong armies, comprising a force of fifty thousand men, had been raised for the coming campaign. Essex, with the army of the centre, was charged with the duty of watching the King at Oxford, and following him if he moved, as was expected, to the north against the Scots. Waller, with the army of the west, was ordered to check Prince Maurice, in Dorset and Devon. The force of fourteen thousand men which had been raised by the zeal of the eastern counties, and in which Cromwell's name was becoming famous as a leader, was raised into a third army under Lord Manchester, and directed to co-operate in Yorkshire with Sir Thomas Fairfax and the Scots. Charles was at once thrown on the defensive. The Irish troops whose aid he had secured by his truce with the rebels were cut to pieces soon after their arrival in England, those who landed in the south by Waller, and their fellows in Cheshire by Sir Thomas Fairfax. The hands of the last commander had been freed by the march of Newcastle to the Border, which the Scots were crossing "in a great frost and snow;" but after his dispersion of the Irish troops, he at once

called back his opponent to York by a victory on his return over the forces which the Marquis had left to protect that capital. The plan of Pym was now rapidly developed. Essex and Waller joined in the blockade of Oxford, while Manchester and Fairfax united with the Scots under the walls of York. Newcastle's cry for aid had already been answered by the despatch of Prince Rupert from Oxford to gather forces on the Welsh border; and the brilliant partizan, after breaking the sieges of Newark and Latham House, burst over the Lancashire Hills into Yorkshire, slipped by the Parliamentary army, and made his way untouched into York. But the success of his feat of arms tempted him to a fresh act of daring; he resolved on a decisive battle, and a discharge of musketry from the two armies as they faced each other on Marston Moor brought on, as evening gathered, a disorderly engagement. On the one flank a charge of the King's horse broke that of the Scotch; on the other, Cromwell's brigade of "Ironsides" won as complete a success over Rupert's troopers. "God made them as stubble to our swords," wrote the general at the close of the day; but in the heat of victory he called back his men from the chase to back Manchester in his attack on the Royalist foot, and to rout their other wing of horse as it returned breathless from pursuing the Scots. Nowhere had the fighting been so fierce. A young Puritan who lay dying on the field told Cromwell as he bent over him that one thing lay on his spirit. "I asked him what it was," Cromwell wrote afterwards. "He told me it was that God had not suffered him to be any more the executioner of his enemies." At night-fall all was over; and the Royalist cause in the north had perished at a single blow. Newcastle fled over sea: York surrendered, and Rupert, with hardly a man at his back, rode southward to Oxford. The blow was the more terrible that it fell on Charles at a moment when his triumph in every other quarter was being secured by a series of brilliant and unexpected successes. After a month's siege the King had escaped from Oxford; had waited till Essex marched into the west; and then, turning fiercely on Waller at Cropredy Bridge, had driven him back broken to London, two days before the battle at Marston Moor. Charles followed up his success by hurrying in the track of Essex, whom he hoped to crush between his own force and that under Prince Maurice which the Earl had marched to attack. By a fatal error, Essex plunged into Cornwall, where the country was hostile, and where the King hemmed him in among the hills, drew his lines tightly round his army, and forced the whole body of the foot to surrender at his mercy, while the horse cut their way through the besiegers, and Essex himself fled by sea to London. The day of the surrender was signalized by a Royalist triumph in Scotland which promised to undo what Marston Moor had done. The plot which had long since been formed for the conquest of Scotland was revived by the landing of Irish soldiers in Argyle. Montrose, throwing himself into the Highlands, called the clans to arms;

1642
to
1648
—
Jan.
1644

July 1,
1644

1642 and flinging his new force on that of the Covenanters at Tipper-
 to muir, gained a victory which enabled him to occupy Perth, to
 1646 sack Aberdeen, and to spread terror to Edinburgh. The news fired
 Charles, as he came up from the west, to venture on a march upon
 London; but though the Scots were detained by the siege of New-
 castle, the rest of the victors at Marston Moor lay in his path at
 Newbury, and their force was strengthened by the army which had
 surrendered in Cornwall, and was again brought into the field.
 The furious charges of the Royalists failed to break the Parlia-
 mentary squadrons, and the soldiers of Essex wiped away the shame
 of their defeat by flinging themselves on the cannon they had lost,
 and bringing them back in triumph to their lines. Cromwell seized
 the moment of victory, and begged hard to be suffered to charge
 with his single brigade. But Manchester, like Essex, shrank from
 a crowning victory over the King. Charles was allowed to with-
 draw his army to Oxford, and even to reappear unchecked in the
 field of his defeat.

Oct. 1644

Crom-
 well

1599

The quarrel of Cromwell with Lord Manchester at Newbury was
 destined to give a new colour and direction to the war. Pym, in
 fact, had hardly been borne to his grave in Westminster Abbey
 before England instinctively recognized a successor of yet greater
 genius in the victor of Marston Moor. Born in the closing years of
 Elizabeth's reign, the child of a cadet of the great house of the
 Cromwells of Hinchinbrook, and connected by their mothers with
 Hampden and St. John, Oliver had been recalled by his father's
 death from a short stay at Cambridge to the little family estate at
 Huntingdon, which he quitted for a farm at St. Ives. We have
 already seen his mood during the years of Tyranny, as he dwelt
 in "prolonging" and "blackness" amidst fancies of coming death,
 the melancholy which formed the ground of his nature feeding
 itself on the inaction of the time. But his energy made itself felt
 the moment the Tyranny was over. His father had sat, with three
 of his uncles, in the later Parliaments of Elizabeth. Oliver had
 himself been returned to that of 1628, and the town of Cambridge
 sent him as its representative to the Short Parliament as to the
 Long. It is in the latter that a courtier, Sir Philip Warwick, gives
 us our first glimpse of his actual appearance. "I came into the
 House one morning, well clad, and perceived a gentleman speaking
 whom I knew not, very ordinarily appparelled, for it was a plain
 cloth-suit, which seemed to have been made by an ill country
 tailor. His linen was plain, and not very clean; and I remember a
 speck or two of blood upon his little band, which was not much
 larger than his collar. His hat was without a hat-band. His stature
 was of a good size; his sword stuck close to his side; his counten-
 ance swoln and reddish; his voice sharp and untuneable, and his
 eloquence full of fervour." He was already "much hearkened
 unto," but his power was to assert itself in deeds rather than in
 words. He appeared at the head of a troop of his own raising at
 Edgehill; but with the eye of a born soldier he at once saw the

1642
to
1646

blot in the army of Essex. "A set of poor tapsters and town apprentices," he warned Hampden, "would never fight against men of honour;" and he pointed to religious enthusiasm as the one weapon which could meet and turn the chivalry of the Cavalier. Even to Hampden the plan seemed impracticable; but the regiment of a thousand men which Cromwell raised for the Association of the Eastern Counties, and which soon became known as his Ironsides, was formed strictly of "men of religion." He spent his fortune freely on the task he set himself. "The business . . . hath had of me in money between eleven and twelve hundred pounds, therefore my private estate can do little to help the public. . . . I have little money of my own (left) to help my soldiers." But they were "a lovely company," he tells his friends with soldierly pride. No blasphemy, drinking, disorder, or impiety were suffered in their ranks. "Not a man swears but he pays his twelve pence." Nor was his choice of "men of religion" the only innovation Cromwell introduced into his new regiment. The social traditions which restricted command to men of birth were disregarded. "It may be," he wrote, in answer to complaints from the committee of the Association, "it provokes your spirit to see such plain men made captains of horse. It had been well that men of honour and birth had entered into their employments; but why do they not appear? But seeing it is necessary the work must go on, better plain men than none: but best to have men patient of wants, faithful and conscientious in their employment, and such, I hope, these will approve themselves." The words paint Cromwell's temper accurately enough: he is far more of the practical soldier than of the theological reformer; though his genius already breaks in upon his aristocratic and conservative sympathies, and catches glimpses of the social revolution to which the war was drifting. "I had rather," he once burst out impatiently, "have a plain russet-coated captain, that knows what he fights for and loves what he knows, than what you call a gentleman, and is nothing else. I honour a gentleman that is so indeed!" he ends with a characteristic return to his more common mood of feeling. The same practical temper broke out in an innovation which had more immediate results. Bitter as had been his hatred of the bishops, and strenuously as he had worked to bring about a change in Church government, Cromwell, like most of the Parliamentary leaders, seems to have been content with the new Presbyterianism, and the Presbyterians were more than content with him. Lord Manchester "suffered him to guide the army at his pleasure." "The man, Cromwell," writes the Scotchman Baillie, "is a very wise and active head, universally well beloved as religious and stout." But against dissidents from their own system, the Presbyterians were as bitter as Laud himself; and, as we shall see, Non-conformity was now rising every day into larger proportions, while the new claim of liberty of worship was becoming one of the problems of the time. Cromwell met the problem in his unspeculative

1642
to
1646

fashion. He wanted good soldiers and good men; and, if they were these, the Independent, the Baptist, the Leveller, found entry among his Ironsides. "You would respect them, did you see them," he answered the panic-stricken Presbyterians who charged them with "Anabaptistry" and revolutionary aims: "they are no Anabaptists: they are honest, sober Christians; they expect to be used as men." He was soon to be driven—as in the social change we noticed before—to a far larger and grander point of view. "The State," he boldly laid down at last, "in choosing men to serve it, takes no notice of their opinions. If they be willing faithfully to serve it, that satisfies." But as yet he was busier with his new regiment than with theories; and the Ironsides were no sooner in action than they proved themselves such soldiers as the war had never seen yet. "Truly they were never beaten at all," their leader said proudly at its close. At Winceby fight they charged "singing psalms," cleared Lincolnshire of the Cavendishes, and freed the eastern counties from all danger from Newcastle's part. At Marston Moor they faced and routed Rupert's chivalry. At Newbury it was only Manchester's reluctance that hindered them from completing the ruin of Charles.

The
New
Model

Cromwell had shown his capacity for organization in the creation of the Ironsides; his military genius had displayed itself at Marston Moor. Newbury first raised him into a political leader. "Without a more speedy, vigorous, and effective prosecution of the war," he said to the Commons after his quarrel with Manchester, "casting off all lingering proceedings, like those of soldiers of fortune beyond sea to spin out a war, we shall make the kingdom weary of us, and hate the name of a Parliament." But under the leaders who at present conducted it a vigorous conduct of the war was hopeless. They were, in Cromwell's plain words, "afraid to conquer." They desired not to crush Charles, but to force him back, with as much of his old strength remaining as might be, to the position of a constitutional King. The old loyalty, too, clogged their enterprise; they shrank from the taint of treason. "If the King be beaten," Manchester urged at Newbury, "he will still be king; if he beat us he will hang us all for traitors." To a mood like this Cromwell's reply seemed horrible. "If I met the King in battle I would fire my pistol at the King as at another." The army, too, as he long ago urged at Edgehill, was not an army to conquer with. Now, as then, he urged that till the whole force was new modelled, and placed under a stricter discipline, "they must not expect any notable success in anything they went about." But the first step in such a re-organization must be a change of officers. The army was led and officered by members of the two Houses, and the Self-renouncing Ordinance, which was introduced by Cromwell and Vane, declared the tenure of military or civil offices incompatible with a seat in either. In spite of a long and bitter resistance, which was justified at a later time by the political results which followed this rupture of the tie which had hitherto bound the Army

to the Parliament, the drift of public opinion was too strong to be withstood. The passage of the Ordinance brought about the retirement of Essex, Manchester, and Waller; and the new organization of the army went rapidly on under a new commander-in-chief, Sir Thomas Fairfax, the hero of the long contest in Yorkshire, and who had been raised into fame by his victory at Nantwich, and his bravery at Marston Moor. The principles on which Cromwell had formed his Ironsides were carried out on a larger scale in the "New Model." The one aim was to get together twenty thousand "honest" men. "Be careful," Cromwell wrote, "what captains of horse you choose, what men be mounted. A few honest men are better than numbers. If you choose godly honest men to be captains of horse, honest men will follow them." The result was a curious medley of men of different ranks among the officers of the New Model. The bulk of those in high command remained men of noble or gentle blood, Montagues, Pickerings, Fortescues, Sheffields, Sidneys, and the like. But side by side with these, though in far smaller proportion, were seen officers like Ewer, who had been a serving-man, like Okey, who had been a drayman, or Rainsborough, who had been a "skipper at sea." Equally strange was the mixture of religions in its ranks. A clause in the Act for new modelling the army had enabled Fairfax to dispense with the signature of the Covenant in the case of "godly men;" and among the farmers from the eastern counties, who formed the bulk of its privates, dissidence of every type had gained a firm foothold. A result hardly less notable, though less foreseen, was the youth of the officers. Among those in high command there were few who, like Cromwell, had passed middle age. Fairfax was but thirty-three, and most of his colonels were even younger. Of the political aspect of the New Model we shall have to speak at a later time; but as yet its energy was directed solely to "the speedy and vigorous prosecution of the war." The efforts of the peace party were frustrated at the very moment when Fairfax was ready for action by the policy of the King. From the moment when Newbury marked the breach between the peace and war parties in the Parliament, the Scotch Commissioners had been backed by the former in pressing for fresh negotiations with Charles. These were opened at Uxbridge, and prolonged for six months; but the hopes of concession which Charles had held out through the winter were suddenly withdrawn in the spring. He saw, as he thought, the Parliamentary army dissolved and ruined by the new modelling, at the instant when news came from Scotland of fresh successes on the part of Montrose, and of his overthrow of the Marquis of Argyle's troops in the victory of Inverlochy. "Before the end of the summer," wrote the conqueror, "I shall be in a position to come to your Majesty's aid with a brave army." The negotiations at Uxbridge were at once broken off, and a few months later the King opened his campaign by a march to the north where he hoped to form a junction with Montrose. Leicester was stormed, the blockade of Chester

1642
to
1646
—
April,
1645

1642
to
1646

raised, and the eastern counties threatened, until Fairfax, who had hoped to draw Charles back again by a blockade of Oxford, hurried at last on his track. Cromwell, who had been suffered by the House to retain his command for a few days, joined Fairfax as he drew near the King, and his arrival was greeted by loud shouts of welcome from the troops. The two armies met near Naseby, to the north-west of Northampton. The King was eager to fight. "Never have my affairs been in as good a state," he cried; and Prince Rupert was as impatient as his uncle. On the other side, even Cromwell doubted the success of the new experiment. "I can say this of Naseby," he wrote soon after, "that when I saw the enemy draw up and march in gallant order towards us, and we a company of poor ignorant men, to seek to order our battle, the general having commanded me to order all the horse, I could not, riding alone about my business, but smile out to God in praises, in assurance of victory, because God would by things that are not bring to nought things that are. Of which I had great assurance, and God did it." The battle began with a furious charge of Rupert uphill, which routed the wing opposed to him under Ireton; while the Royalist foot, after a single discharge, clubbed their muskets and fell on the centre under Fairfax so hotly that it slowly and stubbornly gave way. But the Ironsides were conquerors on the left. A single charge broke the northern horse under Langdale, who had already fled before them at Marston Moor; and holding his troops firmly in hand, Cromwell fell with them on the flank of the Royalist foot in the very crisis of its success. A panic of the Royal reserve, and its flight from the field, aided his efforts: it was in vain that Rupert returned with forces exhausted by pursuit, that Charles, in a passion of despair, called on his troopers for "one charge more." The battle was over: artillery, baggage, even the Royal papers, fell into the conquerors' hands: five thousand men surrendered; only two thousand followed the King in his headlong flight upon the west. The war was ended at a blow. While Charles wandered helplessly in search of fresh forces, Fairfax marched rapidly into Somersetshire, routed the Royal forces at Langport, and in three weeks was master of the west. A victory at Kilsyth, which gave Scotland for the moment to Montrose, threw a transient gleam over the darkening fortunes of his master's cause; but the surrender of Bristol, and the dispersion of the last force Charles could collect in an attempt to relieve Chester, was followed by

June 14,
1645

news of the crushing and irretrievable defeat of the "Great Marquis" at Philiphaugh. In the wreck of the Royal cause we may pause for a moment over an incident which brings out in relief the best temper of both sides. Cromwell "spent much time with God in prayer before the storm" of Basing House, where the Marquis of Winchester had held stoutly out through the war for the King. The storm ended its resistance, and the brave old Royalist was brought in a prisoner with his house flaming around him. He "broke out," reports a Puritan bystander, "and said,

Sept.
1645

'that if the King had no more ground in England but Basing House he would adventure it as he did, and so maintain it to the uttermost,' comforting himself in this matter 'that Basing House was called Loyalty.' " Of loyalty such as this Charles was utterly unworthy. The seizure of his papers at Naseby had hardly disclosed his intrigues with the Irish Catholics when the Parliament was able to reveal to England a fresh treaty with them, which purchased no longer their neutrality, but their aid, by the simple concession of every demand they had made. The shame was without profit, for whatever aid Ireland might have given came too late to be of service. The spring of the following year saw the few troops who still clung to Charles surrounded and routed at Stow. "You have done your work now," their leader, Sir Jacob Astley, said bitterly to his conquerors, "and may go to play, unless you fall out among yourselves."

1646
to
1649

1646

SECTION VIII.—THE ARMY AND THE PARLIAMENT, 1646—1649

[*Authorities.*—To those already mentioned may be added Herbert's "Ménnoirs," and the "Eikon Basilike." For Scottish history, Burnet, "Lives of the Hamiltons." For the Independents, Masson, "Life of Milton."]

With the close of the Civil War we enter on a short period of The confused struggles, tedious and uninteresting in its outer details, Independents but of far higher interest than even the War itself in its bearing on our after history. Modern England, the England among whose thoughts and sentiments we actually live, began with the triumph of Naseby. Old things passed suddenly away. When Astley gave up his sword the "work" of the generations which had struggled for Protestantism against Catholicism, for public liberty against absolute rule, in his own emphatic phrase, was "done." So far as these contests were concerned, however the later Stuarts might strive to revive them, England could safely "go to play." But with the end of this older work a new work at once began. The constitutional and ecclesiastical problems which still in one shape or another beset us started to the front as subjects of national debate in the years between the close of the Civil War and the death of the King. The two great parties which have ever since divided the social, the political, and the religious life of England, whether as Independents and Presbyterians, as Whigs and Tories, or as Conservatives and Liberals, sprang into organized existence in the contest between the Army and the Parliament. Then for the first time began the struggle between political tradition and political progress, between the principle of religious conformity and the principle of religious freedom, which is far from having ended yet.

It was the religious struggle which drew the political in its train. We have already witnessed the rise under Elizabeth of sects who did not aim, like the Presbyterians, at a change in Church govern-

1648
to
1649

ment, but rejected the notion of a national Church at all, and insisted on the right of each congregation to perfect independence of faith and worship. At the close of the Queen's reign, however, these "Brownists," as they were called from one Brown, a clergyman who maintained their tenets, had almost entirely disappeared. Some, as we saw in the notable instance of the congregation which produced the Pilgrim Fathers, had found a refuge in Holland, but the bulk had been driven to a fresh conformity with the Established Church. "As for those which we call Brownists," says Bacon, "being when they were at the best a very small number of very silly and base people, here and there in corners dispersed, they are now (thanks be to God) by the good remedies that have been used, suppressed and worn out so as there is scarce any news of them." As soon, however, as Abbot's primacy promised a milder rule, the Separatist refugees began to venture timidly back again to England. During their exile in Holland the main body, under Robinson, had contented themselves with the free development of their system of independent congregations, each forming in itself a complete Church, and to them the name of Independents at a later time attached itself. A small part, however, had drifted into a more marked severance in doctrine from the Established Church, especially in their belief of the necessity of adult baptism, a belief from which their obscure congregation at Leyden became known as that of the Baptists. Both of these sects gathered a church in London in the middle of James's reign, but the persecuting zeal of Laud prevented any spread of their opinions under that of his successor; and it was not till their numbers were suddenly increased by the return of a host of emigrants from New England, with Hugh Peters at their head, on the opening of the Long Parliament, that the Congregational or Independent body began to attract attention. Lilburne and Burton soon declared themselves adherents of what was called "the New England way;" and a year later saw in London alone the rise of "four score congregations of several sectaries," as Bishop Hall scornfully tells us, "instructed by guides fit for them, cobblers, tailors, felt-makers, and such-like trash." But little religious weight however could be attributed as yet to the Congregational movement. Baxter at this time had not heard of the existence of any Independents. Milton in his earlier pamphlets shows no sign of their influence. Of the hundred and five ministers present in the Westminster Assembly only five were Congregational in sympathy, and these were all returned refugees from Holland. Among the one hundred and twenty London ministers in 1643, only three were suspected of leaning towards the Sectaries.

Presby-
terian
England

The struggle with Charles in fact at its outset only threw new difficulties in the way of religious freedom. It was with strictly conservative aims in ecclesiastical as in political matters that Pym and his colleagues began the strife. Their avowed purpose was simply to restore the Church of England to its state under Eliza-

beth, and to free it from "innovations," from the changes introduced by Laud and his fellow prelates. The great majority of the Parliament were averse to any alterations in the constitution or doctrine of the Church itself; and it was only the refusal of the bishops to accept any diminution of their power and revenues, the growth of a party hostile to Episcopalian Government, the necessity for purchasing the aid of the Scots by a union in religion as in politics, and above all the urgent need of constructing some new ecclesiastical organization in the place of the older organization which had become impossible from the Royalist attitude of the bishops, that forced on the two Houses the adoption of the Covenant. But the change to a Presbyterian system of Church government seemed at that time of little import to the bulk of Englishmen. The Laudian dogma of the necessity of bishops was held by few; and the change was generally regarded with approval as one which brought the Church of England nearer to that of Scotland, and to the reformed Churches of the continent. But whatever might be the change in its administration, no one imagined that it had ceased to be the Church of England. The Tudor theory of its relation to the State, of its right to embrace all Englishmen within its pale, and to dictate what should be their faith and form of worship, remained utterly unquestioned by any man of note. The sentiments on which such a theory rested indeed for its main support, the power of historical tradition, the association of "dissidence" with danger to the state, the strong English instinct of order, the as strong English dislike of "innovations," with the abhorrence of "indifferency," as a sign of luke-warmness in matters of religion, had only been intensified by the earlier incidents of the struggle with the King. The Parliament therefore had steadily pressed on the new system of ecclesiastical government in the midst of the troubles of the war. An Assembly of Divines assembled at Westminster received orders to revise the Articles, to draw up a Confession of Faith, and a Directory of Public Worship, and these, with their scheme of Church government, a scheme only distinguished from that of Scotland by the significant addition of a lay court of superior appeal set by Parliament over the whole system of Church courts and assemblies, were accepted by the Houses and embodied in a series of Ordinances.

Had the change been made at the moment when "with uplifted hands" the Commons swore to the Covenant in St. Margaret's it would probably have been accepted by the country at large. But it met with a very different welcome when it came at the end of the war. In spite of repeated votes of Parliament for its establishment, the pure Presbyterian system took root only in London and Lancashire. While the Divines, indeed, were drawing up their platform of uniform belief and worship in the Jerusalem Chamber dissidence had grown into a religious power. In the terrible agony of the long struggle against Charles, individual conviction became a stronger force than religious tradition. Theological speculation

1646
to
1649

1643
to
1648

Freedom
of Con-
science

1646
to
1649

took an unprecedented boldness from the temper of the times. Four years after the war had begun a horror-stricken pamphleteer numbered sixteen religious sects as existing in defiance of the law; and, widely as these bodies differed among themselves, all at one in repudiating any right of control in faith or worship by the Church or its clergy. Milton, who had left his Presbyterian standpoint, saw at last that "new Presbyter is but old Priest writ large." The question of sectarianism soon grew into a practical one from its bearing on the war: for the class specially infected with the new spirit of religious freedom was just the class to whose zeal and vigour the Parliament was forced to look for success in its struggle. We have seen the prevalence of this spirit among the farmers from whom Cromwell drew his Ironsides, and his enlistment of these "sectaries" was the first direct breach in the old system of conformity. Cromwell had signed the Covenant, and there is no reason for crediting him with any aversion to Presbyterianism as a system of doctrine or of Church organization. His first step, indeed, was a purely practical one, a step dictated by military necessities, and excused in his mind by a sympathy with "honest" men, as well as by the growing but still vague notion of a communion among Christians wider than that of outer conformity in worship or belief. But the alarm and remonstrances of the Presbyterians forced his mind rapidly forward. "The State in choosing men to serve it," Cromwell wrote before Marston Moor, "takes no notice of their opinions. If they be willing faithfully to serve it, that satisfies." Marston Moor encouraged him to press on the Parliament the necessity of at least "tolerating" dissidents, and he succeeded in procuring the appointment of a committee to find some means of effecting this. But the conservative temper of the Presbyterian Churchmen was fairly roused by his act, and by the growth of sectarianism. "We detest and abhor," wrote the London clergy in 1645, "the much endeavoured Toleration." The corporation of London petitioned Parliament to suppress "all sects without toleration." The Parliament itself was steadily on the conservative side, but the fortunes of the war told as steadily against conservatism. Essex and the Presbyterians marched from defeat to defeat. It was necessary to new model the army, and to raise the New Model it was found necessary to give Fairfax power to dispense with any signatures to the Covenant. The victory of Naseby raised a far wider question than that of mere toleration. "Honest men served you faithfully in this action," Cromwell wrote to the Speaker of the House of Commons from the very field. "Sir, they are trusty: I beseech you in the name of God not to discourage them. He that ventures his life for the liberty of his country, I wish he trust God for the liberty of his conscience." The storm of Bristol encouraged him to proclaim the new principles yet more distinctly. "Presbyterians, Independents, all here have the same spirit of faith and prayer, the same presence and answer. They agree here, have no names of difference; pity

it is it should be otherwise anywhere. All that believe have the real unity, which is the most glorious, being the inward and spiritual, in the body and in the head. For being united in forms (commonly called uniformity), every Christian will for peace' sake study and do as far as conscience will permit. And from brethren in things of the mind we look for no compulsion but that of light and reason."

1646
to
1649

The increasing firmness of Cromwell's language was due to the growing irritation of his Presbyterian opponents. The two parties became every day more clearly defined. The Presbyterian ministers complained bitterly of the increase of the sectaries, and denounced the existing toleration. Scotland, whose army was still before Newark, pressed for the execution of the Covenant and the universal enforcement of a Presbyterian uniformity. Sir Harry Vane, on the other hand, was striving to bring the Parliament round to less rigid courses by the introduction of two hundred and thirty new members, who filled the seats left vacant by Royalist secessions, and the more eminent of whom, such as Ireton and Algernon Sidney, were inclined to the Independents. The pressure of the New Model, and the remonstrances of Cromwell as its mouthpiece, hindered any effective movement towards persecution. Amidst the wreck of his fortunes Charles intrigued busily with both parties, and promised liberty of worship to Vane and the Independents, at the moment when he was negotiating for a refuge with the Presbyterian Scots. His negotiations were quickened by the march of Fairfax upon Oxford. Driven from his last refuge, the King after some aimless wanderings made his appearance in the camp of the Scots. Lord Leven at once fell back with his Royal prize on Newcastle. The new aspect of affairs threatened the party of religious freedom with ruin. Hated as they were, by the Scots, by the Lords, by the city of London, the apparent junction of Charles with their enemies destroyed their growing hopes in the Commons, where the prospects of a speedy peace on Presbyterian terms at once swelled the majority of their opponents. The two Houses laid their conditions of peace before the King without a dream of resistance from one who seemed to have placed himself at their mercy. They required for the Parliament the command of the army and fleet for twenty years; the exclusion of all "Malignants," or Royalists who had taken part in the war, from civil and military office; the abolition of Episcopacy; and the establishment of a Presbyterian Church. Of toleration or liberty of conscience they said not a word. The Scots pressed these terms on the King "with tears;" his Royalist friends, and even the Queen, urged their acceptance. But the aim of Charles was simply delay. Time and the dissensions of his enemies, as he believed, were fighting for him. "I am not without hope," he wrote coolly, "that I shall be able to draw either the Presbyterians or the Independents to side with me for extirpating one another, so that I shall be really King again." His refusal of the terms offered by the Houses was a defeat for the Presbyterians. "What will become

Charles
and the
Presby-
terians

May,
1646

1646
to
1649

of us," asked one of them, "now that the King has rejected our proposals?" "What would have become of us," retorted an Independent, "had he accepted them?" The vigour of Holles and the Conservative leaders in the Parliament rallied however to a bolder effort. While the Scotch army lay at Newcastle they could not insist on dismissing their own. But the withdrawal of the Scots from England would not only place the King's person in the hands of the Houses, but enable them to free themselves from the pressure of their own soldiers by disbanding the New Model. Hopeless of success with the King, and unable to bring him into Scotland in face of the refusal of the General Assembly to receive a sovereign who would not swear to the Covenant, the Scottish army accepted £400,000 in discharge of its claims, handed Charles over to a committee of the Houses, and marched back over the Border. Masters of the King, the Presbyterian leaders at once moved boldly to their attack on the Sectaries. They voted that the army should be disbanded, and that a new army should be raised for the suppression of the Irish rebellion with strictly Presbyterian officers at its head. It was in vain that the men protested against being severed from "officers that we love," and that the Council of Officers strove to gain time by pressing on the Parliament the danger of mutiny. Holles and his fellow leaders were resolute, and their ecclesiastical legislation showed the end at which their resolution aimed. Direct enforcement of conformity was impossible till the New Model was disbanded; but the Parliament pressed on in the work of providing the machinery for enforcing it as soon as the army was gone. Vote after vote ordered the setting up of Presbyteries throughout the country, and the first fruits of these efforts were seen in the Presbyterian organization of London, and in the first meeting of its Synod at St. Paul's. Even the officers on Fairfax's staff were ordered to take the Covenant.

Jan.
1617

The
Army
and the
Parliament

All hung however on the disbanding of the New Model, and the New Model showed no will to disband itself. Its new attitude can only fairly be judged by remembering what the conquerors of Naseby really were. They were soldiers of a different class and of a different temper from the soldiers of any other army that the world has seen. Their ranks were filled for the most part with young farmers and tradesmen of the lower sort, maintaining themselves, for their pay was twelvemonths in arrear, mainly at their own cost. They had been specially picked as "honest" or religious men, and, whatever enthusiasm or fanaticism they may have shown, their very enemies acknowledged the order and piety of their camp. They looked on themselves not as swordsmen, to be caught up and flung away at the will of a paymaster, but as men who had left farm and merchandise at a direct call from God. A great work had been given them to do, and the call bound them till it was done. Kingcraft, as Charles was hoping, might yet restore tyranny to the throne. A more immediate danger threatened that liberty of conscience which was to them "the ground of the quarrel,

d for which so many of their friends' lives had been lost, and so much of their own blood has been spilt." They would wait before banding till these liberties were secured, and if need came they would again act to secure them. But their resolve sprang from no deed in the brute force of the sword they wielded. On the contrary, they pleaded passionately at the bar of the Commons, "on coming soldiers we have not ceased to be citizens." Their aims and proposals throughout were purely those of citizens, and of citizens who were ready the moment their aim was won to return peacefully to their homes. Thought and discussion had turned the army into a vast Parliament, a Parliament which regarded itself as the representatives of "godly" men in as high a degree as the Parliament at Westminster, and which must have become every day more conscious of its superiority in political capacity to rival. Ireton, the moving spirit of the New Model, had no equal a statesman in St. Stephen's: nor is it possible to compare the long and far-sighted proposals of the army with the blind and hasty policy of the two Houses. Whatever we may think of the means by which the New Model sought its aims, we must in justice remember that, so far as those aims went, the New Model was in the right. For the last two hundred years England has been doing little more than carrying out in a slow and tentative way the scheme of political and religious reform which the army propounded the close of the Civil War. It was not till the rejection of the officers' proposals had left little hope of conciliation that the army acted, but its action was quick and decisive. It set aside for all political purposes the Council of Officers, and elected a new Council of Adjutors or Assistants, two members being named by each regiment, which summoned a general meeting of the army at Weymouth Heath, where the proposals of pay and disbanding made to the Parliament were rejected with cries of "Justice." While the army was gathering, in fact, the Adjutors had taken a step which put submission out of the question. A rumour that the King was to be removed to London, a new army raised, a new civil war begun, roused the soldiers to madness. Five hundred troopers suddenly appeared before Holmby House, where the King was residing in charge of the Parliamentary Commissioners, and dispersed its guards. "Where is your commission for this act?" Charles asked the cornet who commanded them. "It is behind me," said Joyce, pointing to his soldiers. "It is written in very plain and legible characters," laughed the King. The seizure had in fact been previously concerted between Charles and the Adjutors. "I will part willingly," he told Joyce, "if the soldiers affirm all that you have promised me. You will exact from me nothing that offends my conscience or my honour." "It is not my maxim," replied the cornet, "to constrain the conscience of anyone, still less that of our King." After a first burst of terror at the news, the Parliament fell furiously on Cromwell, who had relinquished his command and quitted the army before the close of the

1649
to
1649

June,
1647

1646
to
1649

war, and had ever since been employed as a mediator between the two parties. The charge of having incited the mutiny fell before his vehement protest, but he was driven to seek refuge with the army, and in three days it was in full march upon London. Its demands were expressed with perfect clearness in an "Humble Representation" which it addressed to the Houses. "We desire a settlement of the Peace of the kingdom and of the liberties of the subject according to the votes and declarations of Parliament. We desire no alteration in the civil government: as little do we desire to interrupt or in the least to intermeddle with the settling of the Presbyterian government." They demanded toleration; but "not to open a way to licentious living under pretence of obtaining ease for tender consciences, we profess, as ever, in these things when the state has made a settlement we have nothing to say, but to submit or suffer." It was with a view to such a settlement that they demanded the expulsion of eleven members from the Commons, with Holles at their head, whom the soldiers charged with stirring up strife between the army and the Parliament, and with a design of renewing the civil war. After fruitless negotiations the terror of the Londoners forced the eleven to withdraw; and the Houses named Commissioners to treat on the questions at issue.

The
Army
and the
King

Though Fairfax and Cromwell had at last been forced from their position as mediators into a hearty co-operation with the army, its political direction rested at this moment with Cromwell's son-in-law, Henry Ireton, and Ireton looked for a real settlement, not to the Parliament, but to the King. "There must be some difference," he urged bluntly, "between conquerors and conquered;" but the terms which he laid before Charles were terms of studied moderation. The vindictive spirit which the Parliament had shown against the Royalists and the Church disappeared in the terms he laid before the King; and the army contented itself with the banishment of seven leading "delinquents," a general Act of Oblivion for the rest, the withdrawal of all coercive power from the clergy, the control of Parliament over the military and naval forces for ten years, and its nomination of the great officers of State. Behind these demands however came the masterly and comprehensive plan of political reform which had already been sketched by the army in the "Humble Representation," with which it had begun its march on London. Belief and worship were to be free to all. Acts enforcing the use of the Prayer-book, or attendance at Church, or the enforcement of the Covenant were to be repealed. Even Papists, whatever other restraints might be imposed, were to be freed from the bondage of compulsory worship. Parliaments were to be triennial, and the House of Commons to be reformed by a fairer distribution of seats and of electoral rights; taxation was to be readjusted; legal procedure simplified; a crowd of political, commercial, and judicial privileges abolished. Ireton believed that Charles could be "so managed" (says Mrs. Hutchinson) "as to comply with the public good of his people after he could no longer

hold his violent will." But Charles was equally dead to the moderation and to the wisdom of this great Act of Settlement. He saw in the crisis nothing but an opportunity of balancing one party against another; and believed that the army had more need of his aid than he of the army's. "You cannot do without me—I am lost if I do not support you," he said to Ireton as he pressed his proposals. "You have an intention to be the arbitrator between us and the Parliament," Ireton quietly replied, "and we mean to be so between the Parliament and your Majesty." But the King's tone was soon explained by a rising of the London mob which broke into the House of Commons, and forced its members to recall the eleven. While fourteen peers and a hundred Commons men fled to the army, those who remained at Westminster prepared for an open struggle with it, and invited Charles to return to London. But the army was again on the march. "In two days," Cromwell said coolly, "the city will be in our hands." The soldiers entered London in triumph, and restored the fugitive members; the eleven were again expelled, and the army leaders resumed negotiations with the King. The indignation of the soldiers at his delays and intrigues made the task hourly more difficult; but Cromwell, who now threw his whole weight on Ireton's side, clung to the hope of accommodation with a passionate tenacity. His mind, conservative by tradition, and above all practical in temper, saw the practical difficulties which would follow on the abolition of Royalty, and in spite of the King's evasions he persisted in negotiating with him. But Cromwell stood almost alone; the Parliament refused to accept Ireton's proposals as a basis of peace. Charles still evaded, and the army then grew restless and suspicious. There were cries for a wide reform, for the abolition of the House of Peers, for a new use of Commons; and the Adjutors called on the Council of Officers to discuss the question of abolishing Royalty itself. Cromwell was never braver than when he faced the gathering storm, bade the discussion, adjourned the Council, and sent the officers to their regiments. But the strain was too great to last long, and Charles was still resolute to "play his game." He was in fact so far from being in earnest in his negotiations with Cromwell and Ireton, that at the moment they were risking their lives for him was conducting another and equally delusive negotiation with the Parliament, fomenting the discontent in London, preparing for a fresh Royalist rising, and for an invasion of the Scots in his own country. "The two nations," he wrote joyously, "will soon be at war." All that was needed for the success of his schemes was his own liberty; and in the midst of his hopes of an accommodation Cromwell found with astonishment that he had been duped throughout, and that the King had fled.

The flight fanned the excitement of the army into frenzy, and by the courage of Cromwell averted an open mutiny in its gathering at Ware. But even Cromwell was powerless to break the spirit which now pervaded the soldiers, and the King's perfidy left him

1646
to
1649

Nov.
1647

The
Second
Civil
War

1646
to
1649

without resource. "The King is a man of great parts and great understanding," he said at last, "but so great a dissembler and so false a man that he is not to be trusted." By a strange error Charles had made his way from Hampton Court to the Isle of Wight, perhaps with some hope from the sympathy of Colonel Hammond, the Governor of Carisbrook Castle, and again found himself a prisoner. Foiled in his effort to put himself at the head of the new civil war, he set himself to organize it from his prison; and while again opening delusive negotiations with the Parliament, he signed a secret treaty with the Scots for the invasion of the realm. The rise of Independency, and the practical suspension of the Covenant, had produced a violent reaction in his favour north of the Tweed. The nobles gathered round the Duke of Hamilton, and carried the elections against Argyle and the adherents of the Parliament; and on the King's consenting to a stipulation for the re-establishment of Presbytery in England, they ordered an army to be levied for his support. In England the whole of the conservative party, with many of the most conspicuous members of the Long Parliament at its head, was drifting, in its horror of the religious and political changes which seemed impending, towards the King; and the news from Scotland gave the signal for fitful insurrections in almost every quarter. London was only held down by main force, old officers of the Parliament unfurled the Royal flag in South Wales, and surprised Pembroke. The seizure of Berwick and Carlisle opened a way for the Scotch invasion. Kent, Essex, and Hertford broke out in revolt. The fleet in the Downs sent their captains on shore, hoisted the King's pennon, and blockaded the Thames. "The hour is come for the Parliament to save the kingdom and to govern alone," cried Cromwell; but the Parliament only showed itself eager to take advantage of the crisis to profess its adherence to Royalty, to re-open the negotiations it had broken off with the King, and to deal the fiercest blow at religious freedom which it had ever received. The Presbyterians flocked back to their seats; and an "Ordinance for the suppression of Blasphemies and Heresies," which Vane and Cromwell had long held at bay, was passed by triumphant majorities. Any man—runs this terrible statute—denying the doctrine of the Trinity or of the Divinity of Christ, or that the books of Scripture are not "the Word of God," or the resurrection of the body, or a future day of judgment, and refusing on trial to abjure his heresy, "shall suffer the pain of death." Any man declaring (amidst a long list of other errors) "that man by nature hath free will to turn to God," that there is a Purgatory, that images are lawful, that infant baptism is unlawful; any one denying the obligation of observing the Lord's day, or asserting "that the Church government by Presbytery is anti-Christian or unlawful," shall on a refusal to renounce his errors "be commanded to prison." It was plain that the Presbyterian party counted on the King's success to resume its policy of conformity, and had Charles been free, or the New Model disbanded,

pes would probably have been realized. But Charles, though to escape, was still safe at Carisbrook; and the New Model facing fiercely the danger which surrounded it. The wanton ravage of the war at a moment when all tended to peace swept the mind of Fairfax and Cromwell, as from that of the army at large, every thought of reconciliation with the King. Soldiers and generals were at last bound together again in a stern resolve. The eve of their march against the revolt all gathered in a common prayer-meeting, and came "to a very clear and joint resolution, 'That it was our duty, if ever the Lord brought us again in peace, to call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to account for the blood he has shed and mischief he has done to his country against the Lord's cause and people in this poor nation.'"

Three days Fairfax had trampled down the Kentish insurgents, and had prisoned those of the eastern counties within the walls of Rochester, while Cromwell drove the Welsh insurgents within the walls of Pembroke. Both the towns however held stubbornly out; though a Royalist rising under Lord Holland in the neighbourhood of London was easily put down, there was no force left to the inroad of the Scots, who were pouring over the Border twenty thousand strong. Luckily the surrender of Pembroke at this critical moment set Cromwell free. Pushing rapidly northward with five thousand men, he called in the force under Lambert which had been gallantly hanging on the Scottish flank, and moved over the Yorkshire hills into the valley of the Ribble. The Duke of Hamilton, reinforced by three thousand Royalists of the north, had advanced as far as Preston. With an army which now numbered ten thousand men, Cromwell poured down on the flank of the Duke's straggling line of march, attacked the Scots as they fled behind the Ribble, passed the river with them, cut their wayward to pieces at Wigan, forced the defile at Warrington, and the flying enemy made a last and desperate stand, and threw their foot to surrender, while Lambert hunted down the horse. Fresh from its victory, the New Model moved over the Border, while the peasants of Ayrshire and the north rose in the "Whiggamore raid" (notable as the first event in which we find the name "Whig," which is possibly the same as our "Whig," and conveys a taunt against the "sour-milk" faces of the nautical Ayrshiremen), and, marching upon Edinburgh, dissolved the Royalist party and again installed Argyle in power. Argyle welcomed Cromwell as a deliverer, but the victorious army had hardly entered Edinburgh when he was recalled by the news from the south. The temper with which the Parliament had met the Royalist revolt was, as we have seen, widely different from that of the army. It had recalled the eleven members, and had passed the Ordinance against heresy. At the moment of the story at Preston the Lords were discussing charges of treason against Cromwell, while commissioners had again been sent to the Earl of Wight, in spite of the resistance of the Independents, to

1646
to
1649

Aug. 18,
1648

The
King's
Death

conclude peace with the King. Royalists and Presbyterians alike pressed Charles to grasp the easy terms which were now offered him. But his hopes from Scotland had only broken down to give place to hopes of a new war with the aid of an army from Ireland; and the negotiation saw forty days wasted in useless chicanery. "Nothing," Charles wrote to his friends, "is changed in my designs." But at this moment the surrender of Colchester and the convention with Argyle set free the army, and petitions from its regiments at once demanded "justice on the King." A fresh "Remonstrance" from the Council of Officers called for the election of a new Parliament; for electoral reform; for the recognition of the supremacy of the Parliament "in all things;" for the change of kingship, should it be retained, into a magistracy elected by the Parliament, and without veto on its proceedings; and demanded above all "that the capital and grand author of our troubles, by whose commissions, commands, and procurements, and in whose behalf and for whose interest only, of will and power, all our wars and troubles have been, with all the miseries attending them, may be specially brought to justice for the treason, blood, and mischief he is therein guilty of." The reply of the Parliament to this Remonstrance was to accept the King's concessions, unimportant as they were, as a basis of peace. The step was accepted by the soldiers as a defiance: Charles was again seized by a troop of horse, and carried off to Hurst Castle; while a letter from Fairfax announced the march of his army upon London. "We shall know now," said Vane, as the troops took their post round the Houses of Parliament, "who is on the side of the King, and who on the side of the people." But the terror of the army proved weaker among their members than the agonized loyalty which strove to save Charles, and an immense majority in both Houses still voted for the acceptance of the terms he had offered. The next morning saw Colonel Pride at the door of the House of Commons with a list of forty members of the majority in his hands. The Council of Officers had resolved to exclude them, and as each member made his appearance he was arrested, and put in confinement. "By what right do you act?" a member asked. "By the right of the sword," Hugh Peters is said to have replied. The House was still resolute, but on the following morning forty more members were excluded, and the rest gave way. The formal expulsion of one hundred and forty members left the Independents, who alone remained, free to co-operate with the army which had delivered them; the peace votes were at once rescinded; the removal of Charles to Windsor was followed by an instant resolution for his trial, and by the nomination of a Court of one hundred and fifty Commissioners to conduct it, with John Bradshaw, a lawyer of eminence, at their head. The rejection of this Ordinance by the few peers who remained brought about a fresh resolution from the lower House, "that the People are, under God, the original of all just power; that the Commons of England in

ment assembled—being chosen by, and representing, the o—have the supreme power in this nation; and that what-
r is enacted and declared for law by the Commons in Parlia-
assembled hath the force of a law, and all the people of this
a are concluded thereby, although the consent and con-
nce of the King or House of Peers be not had thereunto."

1646
to
1649

Charles appeared before the Court only to deny its competence
o refuse to plead; but thirty-two witnesses were examined
isfy the consciences of his judges, and it was not till the fifth
f the trial that he was condemned to death as a tyrant, traitor,
erer, and enemy of his country. The popular excitement had
d itself in cries of "Justice," or "God save your Majesty,"
e trial went on, but all save the loud outcries of the soldiers
ushed as Charles passed to receive his doom. The dignity
he had failed to preserve in his long jangling with Bradshaw
he judges returned at the call of death. Whatever had been
ults and follies of his life, "he nothing common did, or mean,
that memorable scene." Two masked executioners awaited
King as he mounted the scaffold, which had been erected
le one of the windows of the Banqueting House at Whitehall;
reets and roofs were thronged with spectators; and a strong
of soldiers stood drawn up beneath. His head fell at the first
and as the executioner lifted it to the sight of all a groan of
ind horror burst from the silent crowd.

Jan. 30.
1649

SECTION IX.—THE COMMONWEALTH, 1649—1653

Authorities.—The Thurloe Papers are the most important source for
eriod; Whitlocke, "Ludlow and the Parliamentary History," is
ie. For Scotland, see Firth, "Scotland under the Commonwealth"
Scotland under the Protectorate." For Ireland, Carte, "History
nes, Duke of Ormond"; the Ormond Papers; and Prendergast,
nwellean Settlement." For foreign affairs, see Ranke and Gar-
whose histories are also the best general accounts of the period.
omwell, see Carlyle, and Firth's "Cromwell."]

e news of the King's death was received throughout Europe
a thrill of horror. The Czar of Russia chased the English
from his court. The ambassador of France was withdrawn
e proclamation of the Republic. The Protestant powers of
ontinent seemed more anxious than any to disavow all con-
n with the Protestant people who had brought a King to the
Holland took the lead in acts of open hostility to the new
as soon as the news of the execution reached the Hague;
ates-General waited solemnly on the Prince of Wales, who
the title of Charles the Second, and recognized him as
esty," while they refused an audience to the English envoys.
Stadtholder, his brother-in-law, the Prince of Orange, was
rted by popular sympathy in the aid and encouragement he

The
Council
of State

afforded to Charles; and the eleven ships of the English fleet, which had found a refuge at the Hague ever since their revolt from the Parliament, were suffered to sail under Rupert's command on an errand of sheer piracy, though with a Royal commission, and to render the seas unsafe for English traders. The danger, however, was far greater nearer home. The Scots proclaimed Charles the Second as their King on the news of his father's death, and at once despatched an embassy to the Hague to invite him to ascend the throne. Ormond, who had at last succeeded in uniting the countless factions who ever since the Rebellion had turned Ireland into a chaos, the old Irish Catholics or native party under Owen Roe O'Neil, the Catholics of the English Pale, the Episcopalian Royalists, the Presbyterian Royalists of the north, called on Charles to land at once in a country where he would find three-fourths of its people devoted to his cause. Nor was the danger from without met by resolution and energy on the part of the diminished Parliament which remained the sole depositary of legal powers. The Commons entered on their new task with hesitation and delay. More than a month passed after the King's execution before the Monarchy was formally abolished, and the government of the nation provided for by the creation of a Council of State consisting of forty-one members selected from the Commons, who were entrusted with full executive power at home or abroad. Two months more elapsed before the passing of the memorable Act which declared "that the People of England and of all the dominions and territories thereunto belonging are, and shall be, and are hereby constituted, made, established, and confirmed to be a Commonwealth and Free State, and shall henceforward be governed as a Commonwealth and Free State by the supreme authority of this nation, the Representatives of the People in Parliament, and by such as they shall appoint and constitute officers and ministers for the good of the people, and that without any King or House of Lords."

he
ump
id the
my

Of the dangers which threatened the new Commonwealth some were more apparent than real. The rivalry of France and Spain, both anxious for its friendship, secured it from the hostility of the greater powers of the Continent, and the ill-will of Holland could be delayed, if not averted, by negotiations. The acceptance of the Covenant was insisted on by Scotland before it would formally receive Charles as its ruler, and nothing but necessity would induce him to comply with such a demand. On the side of Ireland the danger was more pressing, and an army of twelve thousand men was set apart for a vigorous prosecution of the Irish war. The Commonwealth found considerable difficulties at home. The death of Charles gave fresh vigour to the Royalist cause, and the new loyalty was stirred to enthusiasm by the publication of the "Eikon Basilike," a work really due to the ingenuity of Dr. Gauden, a Presbyterian minister, but which was believed to have been composed by the King himself in his later hours of captivity, and which reflected with admirable skill the hopes, the suffering, and

sity of the Royal "martyr." The dreams of a rising were
 ily checked by the execution of the Duke of Hamilton and
 s Holland and Capell, who had till now been confined in the
 r. But the popular disaffection told even on the Council of
 . A majority of its members declined the oath offered to them
 eir earliest meeting, pledging them to an approval of the
 's death and the establishment of the Commonwealth. Half
 udges retired from the bench. Thousands of refusals met the
 nd of an engagement to be faithful to the Republic which
 made from all beneficed clergymen and public functionaries.
 as not till May, and even then in spite of the ill-will of the
 ns, that the Council ventured to proclaim the Commonwealth
 ondon. A yet more formidable peril lay in the selfishness of
 Parliament itself. It was now a mere fragment of the House
 mmons; the members of the Rump—as it was contemptu-
 -called—numbered hardly a hundred, and of those the average
 dance was little more than fifty. In reducing it by "Pride's
 e" to the mere shadow of a House the army had never dreamt
 s continuance as a permanent assembly: it had, in fact,
 ed as a condition of even its temporary continuance that it
 d prepare a bill for the summoning of a fresh Parliament.
 plan put forward by the Council of Officers is still interesting
 o base of many later efforts towards parliamentary reform;
 vised a dissolution in the spring, the assembling every two
 of a new Parliament consisting of four hundred members,
 ed by all householders rateable to the poor, and a redistribu-
 of seats which would have given the privilege of representation
 places of importance. Paid military officers and civil officials
 excluded from election. The plan was apparently accepted
 ne Commons, and a bill based on it was again and again
 ssed; but there was a suspicion that no serious purpose of its
 dissolution was entertained by the House. The popular dis-
 nt at once found a mouthpiece in John Lilburne, a brave,
 eaded soldier, and the excitement of the army appeared
 nly in a formidable mutiny. "You must cut these people
 ees," Cromwell burst out in the Council of State, "or they
 cut you in pieces;" and a forced march of fifty miles to
 rd enabled him to burst on the mutinous regiments at mid-
 ., and to stamp out the revolt. But resolute as he was against
 der, Cromwell went honestly with the army in its demand of a
 Parliament; he believed, and in his harangue to the mutineers
 edged himself to the assertion, that the House purposed to
 lve itself. Within the House, however, a vigorous knot of
 cians was resolved to prolong its existence; and in a witty
 phrase of the story of Moses, Henry Martyn had already
 red the Commonwealth as a new-born and delicate babe, and
 d that "no one is so proper to bring it up as the mother who
 ough it into the world." As yet, however, their intentions
 kept secret, and in spite of the delays thrown in the way of

649 the bill for a new Representative body Cromwell entertained no
to serious suspicion of such a design, when he was summoned to
653 Ireland by a series of Royalist successes which left only Dublin
in the hands of the Parliamentary forces.

e
n-
est of
land
649
649
The storm of Drogheda was the first of a series of awful massacres. The
garrison fought bravely, and repulsed the first attack; but a
second drove Aston and his force back to the Mill-Mount. "Our
men getting up to them," ran Cromwell's terrible despatch, "were
ordered by me to put them all to the sword. And indeed, being in
the heat of action, I forbade them to spare any that were in arms
in the town, and I think that night they put to death about two
thousand men." A few fled to St. Peter's church, "whereupon I
ordered the steeple to be burned, where one of them was heard
to say in the midst of the flames: 'God damn me, I burn, I burn.'"
"In the church itself nearly one thousand were put to the sword.
I believe all their friars were knocked on the head promiscuously
but two," but these were the sole exceptions to the rule of killing
the soldiers only. At a later time Cromwell challenged his enemies
to give "an instance of one man since my coming into Ireland,
not in arms, massacred, destroyed, or burnt." But for soldiers
there was no mercy. Of the remnant who surrendered through
hunger, "when they submitted, their officers were knocked on the
head, every tenth man of the soldiers killed, and the rest shipped
for the Barbadoes." "I am persuaded," the despatch ends, "that
this is a righteous judgment of God upon these barbarous wretches
who have imbrued their hands in so much innocent blood, and
that it will tend to prevent the effusion of blood for the future."
A detachment sufficed to relieve Derry, and to quiet Ulster; and
Cromwell turned to the south, where as stout a defence was followed
by as terrible a massacre at Wexford. Fresh successes at Ross
and Carrick brought him to Waterford; but the city held stub-
bornly out, disease thinned his army, where there was scarce an
officer who had not been sick, and the general himself was arrested
by illness, and at last the tempestuous weather drove him into
winter quarters at Cork with his work half done. The winter was
one of terrible anxiety. The Parliament showed less and less

nation to dissolve itself, and met the growing discontent by a ter censorship of the press and a fruitless prosecution of John arne. English commerce was ruined by the piracies of Rupert's , which now anchored at Kinsale to support the Royalist cause eland. The energy of Vane indeed had already re-created a , squadrons were being despatched into the British seas, the iterranean, and the Levant, and Colonel Blake, who had dis- ished himself by his heroic defence of Taunton during the was placed at the head of a fleet which drove Rupert from the coast, and finally blockaded him in the Tagus. But even energy of Vane quailed before the danger from the Scots. e must go and die there," the young King cried at the news rmond's defeat before Dublin, "for it is shameful for me to elsewhere." But his ardour for an Irish campaign cooled as well marched from victory to victory; and from the isle of ey, which alone remained faithful to him of all his southern inions, Charles renewed the negotiations with Scotland which opes from Ireland had broken. They were again delayed by a osal on the part of Montrose to attack the very Government whom his master was negotiating; but the failure and death e Marquis in the spring forced Charles to accept the Presby- n conditions. The news of the negotiations at Breda filled the iament with dismay, for Scotland was raising an army, and fax, while willing to defend England against a Scotch invasion, pled to take the lead in an invasion of Scotland. The Council lled Cromwell from Ireland, but his cooler head saw that there yet time to finish his work in the west. During the winter he been busily preparing for a new campaign, and it was only the storm of Clonmell, and the overthrow of the Irish army or Hugh O'Neill in the hottest fight the army had yet fought, he embarked again for England.

1649
to
1653

romwell entered London amidst the shouts of a great multi- ; and a month later, as Charles landed on the shores of land. the English army started for the north. It crossed the ed, fifteen thousand men strong; but the terror of the Irish sacres hung round its leader, the country was deserted as he nced, and he was forced to cling for provisions to the fleet h sailed along the coast. Leslie, with a larger force, refused le and lay obstinately in his lines between Edinburgh and h; a march of the English army round his position to the es of the Pentlands only brought about a change of the Scottish t; and as Cromwell fell back baffled upon Dunbar, Leslie mped upon the heights above the town, and cut off the English at along the coast by the seizure of Cockburnspath. His post almost unassailable, while the soldiers of Cromwell fell fast disease; and their general had resolved on an embarkation s forces, when he saw in the dusk of evening signs of move- t in the Scottish camp. Leslie's caution had at last been over- ered by the zeal of the preachers, and his army moved down

1650

Dunbar
and
Wor-
cester

to the lower ground between the hillside on which it was encamped and a little brook which covered the English front. His horse was far in advance of the main body, and it had hardly reached the level ground when Cromwell in the dim dawn flung his whole force upon it. "They run, I profess they run!" he cried as the Scotch horse broke after a desperate resistance, and threw into confusion the foot who were hurrying to their aid. Then, as the sun rose over the mist of the morning, he added in nobler words: "Let God arise, and let his enemies be scattered! Like as the mist vanisheth, so shalt Thou drive them away!" In less than an hour the victory was complete. The defeat at once became a rout; ten thousand prisoners were taken, with all the baggage and guns; three thousand were slain, with scarce any loss on the part of the conquerors. Leslie reached Edinburgh, a general without an army. The effect of Dunbar was at once seen in the attitude of the Continental powers. Spain hastened to recognize the Republic, and Holland offered its alliance. But Cromwell was watching with anxiety the growing discontent at home. The general amnesty claimed by Ireton and the bill for the Parliament's dissolution still hung on hand; the reform of the courts of justice, which had been pressed by the army, failed before the obstacles thrown in its way by the lawyers in the Commons. "Relieve the oppressed," Cromwell wrote from Dunbar, "hear the groans of poor prisoners. Be pleased to reform the abuses of all professions. If there be any one that makes many poor to make a few rich, that suits not a Commonwealth." But the Parliament was seeking to turn the current of public opinion in favour of its own continuance by a great diplomatic triumph. It resolved secretly on the wild project of bringing about a union between England and Holland, and it took advantage of Cromwell's victory to despatch Oliver St. John with a stately embassy to the Hague. His rejection of the alliance and Treaty of Commerce which the Dutch offered were followed by the disclosure of the English proposal of union; but the proposal was at once rejected. The envoys, who returned angrily to the Parliament, attributed their failure to the posture of affairs in Scotland, where Charles was preparing for a new campaign. "I believe the King will set up on his own score now," Cromwell had written after Dunbar. Humiliation after humiliation had been heaped on Charles since he landed in his northern realm. He had subscribed to the Covenant; he had listened to sermons and scoldings from the ministers; he had been called on to sign a declaration that acknowledged the tyranny of his father and the idolatry of his mother. Hardened and shameless as he was, the young King for a moment recoiled. "I could never look my mother in the face again," he cried, "after signing such a paper;" but he signed. He was still, however, a King only in name, shut out from the Council and the army, with his friends excluded from all part in government or the war. But he was at once freed by the victory of Dunbar. With the overthrow of Leslie fell the power of Argyle and the

low Presbyterians whom he led. Hamilton, the brother and assessor of the Duke who had been captured at Preston, brought the Royalists to the camp, and Charles insisted on taking in the Council and on being crowned at Scone. Master of burgh, but foiled in an attack on Stirling, Cromwell waited through the winter and the long spring, while intestine feuds broke the nation opposed to him, and while the stricter Covenanters held sulkily from the Royal army on the return of the "lignants," the "Royalists" of the earlier war, to its ranks.

Summer the campaign recommenced, but Leslie again fell on his system of positions, and Cromwell, finding his camp at Stirling unassailable, crossed into Fife and left the road open to the south. The bait was taken. In spite of Leslie's counsels Charles resolved to invade England, and was soon in full march through Lancashire upon the Severn, with the English horse under Robert hanging on his rear, and the English foot hastening to the road to London by York and Coventry. "We have done the best of our judgment," Cromwell replied to the angry alarm of the Parliament, "knowing that if some issue were not put to business it would occasion another winter's war." At Coventry learnt Charles's position, and swept round by Evesham upon Worcester, where the Scotch King was encamped. Throwing half his force across the river, Cromwell attacked the town on both sides on the anniversary of his victory at Dunbar. He led the van himself, and was "the first to set foot on the enemy's ground." When Charles descended from the Cathedral Tower to fling himself into the eastern division, Cromwell hurried over the river, and was "riding in the midst of the fire." For four or five hours, he and the Parliament, "it was as stiff a contest as ever I have seen;" the Scots outnumbered and beaten into the city gave no answer shot to offers of quarter, and it was not till nightfall that all was over. The loss of the victors was as usual inconsiderable. The vanquished lost six thousand men, and all their baggage and arms. Leslie was among the prisoners: Hamilton among the

1649
to
1653

Sep. 3,
1651

Now that the King is dead and his son defeated," Cromwell spoke gravely to the Parliament, "I think it necessary to come to a settlement." But the settlement which had been promised after Worcester was still as distant as ever after Worcester. The bill for dissolving the present Parliament, though Cromwell pressed it in the House, was only passed, after bitter opposition, by a majority of 51, and even this success had been purchased by a compromise which permitted the House to sit for three years more. Internal affairs were simply at a dead lock. The Parliament appointed committees to prepare plans for legal reforms, or for ecclesiastical reforms, but it did nothing to carry them into effect. It was overborne by the crowd of affairs which the confusion of the war had thrown into its hands, by confiscations, sequestrations, appointments to civil and military offices, the whole administration

The
Dutch
War

1649
to
1653

in fact of the state; and there were times when it was driven to a resolve not to take any private affairs for weeks together in order that it might make some progress with public business. To add to this confusion and muddle there were the inevitable scandals which arose from it; charges of malversation and corruption were hurled at the members of the House; and some, like Haselrig, were accused with justice of using their power to further their own interests. The one remedy for all this was, as the army saw, the assembly of a new and complete Parliament in place of the mere "rump" of the old; but this was the one measure which the House was resolute to avert. Vane spurred it to a new activity. The Amnesty Bill was forced through after fifteen divisions. A Grand Committee, with Sir Matthew Hale at its head, was appointed to consider the reform of the law. The union with Scotland was pushed resolutely forward; eight English Commissioners convoked a Convention of delegates from its counties and boroughs at Edinburgh, and in spite of dogged opposition procured a vote in favour of union. A bill was introduced ratifying the measure, and admitting representatives from Scotland into the next Parliament. A similar plan was soon proposed for a union with Ireland. But it was necessary for Vane's purposes not only to show the energy of the Parliament, but to free it from the control of the army. His aim was to raise in the navy a force devoted to the House and to eclipse the glories of Dunbar and Worcester by yet greater triumphs at sea. With this view the quarrel with Holland had been carefully nursed; a "Navigation Act" prohibiting the importation in foreign vessels of any but the products of the countries to which they belonged struck a fatal blow at the carrying trade from which the Dutch drew their wealth; and fresh debates arose from the English claim to salutes from all vessels in the Channel. The two fleets met before Dover, and a summons from Blake to lower the Dutch flag was met by the Dutch admiral, Van Tromp, with a broadside. The States-General attributed the collision to accident, and offered to recall Van Tromp; but the English demands rose at each step in the negotiations till war became inevitable. The army hardly needed the warning conveyed by the introduction of a bill for its disbanding to understand the new policy of the Parliament. It was significant that while accepting the bill for its own dissolution the House had as yet prepared no plan for the assembly which was to follow it; and the Dutch war had hardly been declared when, abandoning the attitude of inaction which it had observed since the beginning of the Commonwealth, the army petitioned, not only for reform in Church and State, but for an explicit declaration that the House would bring its proceedings to a close. The Petition forced the House to discuss a bill for "a New Representative," but the discussion soon brought out the resolve of the sitting members to continue as a part of the coming Parliament without re-election. The officers, irritated by such a claim, demanded in conference after conference an immediate dissolution,

May,
1652

the House as resolutely refused. In ominous words Cromwell urged the demand of the army. "As for the members of this Parliament, the army begins to take them in disgust. I would it were with less reason." There was just ground, he urged, for content in their selfish greed of houses and lands, the scandalous of many, their partiality as judges, their interference with the ordinary course of law in matters of private interest, their delay of reformation, above all in their manifest design of perpetuating their power. "There is little to hope for from such men," he ended with a return to his predominant thought, "for a settlement of the nation."

1649
to
1653

The crisis was averted for a moment by the events of the war. The terrible storm had separated the two fleets when on the point of meeting in the Orkneys, but Ruyter and Blake met again in the English Channel, and after a fierce struggle the Dutch were forced to retire under cover of night. Since the downfall of Spain Holland had been the first naval power in the world, and the spirit of the nation rose with its earliest defeat. Immense efforts were made to strengthen the fleet, and the veteran, Van Tromp, who was regarded at its head, appeared in the Channel with seventy-three ships. Blake had but half the number, but he at once accepted the challenge, and the unequal fight went on doggedly till nightfall, when the English fleet withdrew shattered into the Thames. Tromp was driven from the Channel in triumph, with a broom at his masthead; and one of the House lowered with the defeat of their favourite.

The
Ejection
of the
Rump

Nov. 30,
1652

A compromise seems to have been arranged between the parties, for the bill providing a new Representative was again passed on; and the Parliament agreed to retire in the coming summer, while Cromwell offered no opposition to a reduction of the army. But the courage of the House rose again with a turn of fortune. The strenuous efforts of Blake enabled him again to meet the Dutch on sea in a few months after his defeat, and a running fight which four days ended at last in an English victory, though Blake's fine seamanship enabled him to save the convoy he was protecting. The House at once insisted on the retention of its power. Not only were the existing members to continue as members of the Parliament, depriving the places they represented of their right of choosing representatives, but they were to constitute a Committee of Revision, to determine the validity of each election, and the fitness of the members returned. A conference took place between the leaders of the Commons and the Officers of the Army, who resolutely demanded not only the omission of these clauses, but that the Parliament should at once dissolve itself, and commit new elections to the Council of State. "Our charge," retorted the Army, "cannot be transferred to any one." The conference was adjourned till the next morning, on an understanding that no further step should be taken; but it had no sooner re-assembled, than the absence of the leading members confirmed the news that the House was fast pressing the bill for a new Representative through

Feb.
1653

1649
to
1653

the House. "It is contrary to common honesty," Cromwell angrily broke out; and, quitting Whitehall, he summoned a company of musketeers to follow him as far as the door of the Commons. He sat down quietly in his place, "clad in plain grey clothes and grey worsted stockings," and listened to Vane's passionate arguments. "I am come to do what grieves me to the heart," he said to his neighbour, St. John, but he still remained quiet, till Vane pressed the House to waive its usual forms and pass the bill at once. "The time has come," he said to Harrison. "Think well," replied Harrison, "it is a dangerous work!" and Cromwell listened for another quarter of an hour. At the question "that this Bill do pass," he at length rose, and his tone grew higher as he repeated his former charges of injustice, self-interest, and delay. "Your hour is come," he ended, "the Lord hath done with you!" A crowd of members started to their feet in angry protest. "Come, come," replied Cromwell, "we have had enough of this;" and striding into the midst of the chamber, he clapt his hat on his head, and exclaimed, "I will put an end to your prating!" In the din that followed his voice was heard in broken sentences—"It is not fit that you should sit here any longer! You should give place to better men! You are no Parliament." Thirty musketeers entered at a sign from their General, and the fifty members present crowded to the door. "Drunkard!" Cromwell broke out as Wentworth passed him; and Martin was taunted with a yet coarser name. Vane, fearless to the last, told him his act was "against all right and all honour." "Ah, Sir Harry Vane, Sir Harry Vane," Cromwell retorted in bitter indignation at the trick he had been played. "You might have prevented all this, but you are a juggler, and have no common honesty! The Lord deliver me from Sir Harry Vane!" The Speaker refused to quit his seat, till Harrison offered to "lend him a hand to come down." Cromwell lifted the mace from the table. "What shall we do with this bauble?" he said. "Take it away!" The door of the house was locked at last, and the dispersion of the Parliament was followed a few hours after by that of its executive committee, the Council of State. Cromwell himself summoned them to withdraw. "We have heard," replied a member, John Bradshaw, "what you have done this morning at the House, and in some hours all England will hear it. But you mistake, sir, if you think the Parliament dissolved. No power on earth can dissolve the Parliament but itself, be sure of that!"

1720,
1653

SECTION X.—THE FALL OF PURITANISM, 1653—1660

1653
to
1660

authorities.—Thurloe's State Papers, the Calendar of State Papers, 1653's "Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell," Ludlow's memoirs, the Clarke Papers, and Whitelocke's "Memorials" are the sources. For the proceedings of the Commonwealth and Protectorate parliaments, see Husband and Scobell's collections of ordinances.

For the restoration, see Clarendon's account; Pepys' "Diary"; Evelyn's "Diary." The Instrument of Government, the Humble Petition and Advice, and the Declaration of Breda will be found in Clarendon's "Documents of the Puritan Revolution." For general history, see Gardiner, "History of the Commonwealth and Protectorate," and Firth's continuation; Ranke, "History of England," and "Cromwell."

The dispersion both of the Parliament and of its executive committee left England without a government, for the authority of the Protectorate ended with that of the body from which his power derived. Cromwell, in fact, as Captain-General of the forces, was himself left solely responsible for the maintenance of public order.

But no thought of military despotism can be fairly traced to the acts of the general or the army. They were in fact far removed from regarding their position as a revolutionary one. Though Cromwell was unable of justification on any formal ground, their proceedings have since been substantially in vindication of the older constitution, and the opinion of the nation had gone fully with the army in its demand for a full and efficient body of representatives, as shown in its resistance to the project by which the Rump would have deprived half England of its rights of election. It was only by other means existed of preventing such a wrong that the Protector had driven out the wrongdoers. "It is you that have brought me to this," Cromwell exclaimed, as he drove the members out of the House; "I have sought the Lord night and day that He would rather slay me than put me upon the doing of this work." The Protectorate was not an act of violence to the members of the House, but the policy which it aimed at preventing was one of violence on their part against the constitutional rights of the whole nation. The people had not been "dissatisfied in every corner of the realm" at the state of public affairs; and the expulsion of the members was justified by a general assent. "We did not hear a dog bark at their going," the Protector said years afterwards. Whatever anxiety may have been felt at the use which was like to be made of "the edge of the sword," was at once dispelled by a proclamation of pardon to the officers. Their one anxiety was "not to grasp the power for ourselves nor to keep it in military hands, no not for a day," and their promise to "call to the government men of approved fidelity and honesty" was redeemed by the nomination of a new Council of State, consisting of eight officers of high rank and four civilians, with Cromwell as their head, and a seat in which was offered, but fruitlessly, to Vane. The first business of such a body was

The
Puritan
Conven-
tion

1653
to
1660

clearly to summon a new Parliament and to resign its trust into its hands: but the bill for Parliamentary reform had dropped with the expulsion: and reluctant as the Council was to summon the new Parliament on the old basis of election, it shrank from the responsibility of effecting so fundamental a change as the creation of a new basis by its own authority. It was this difficulty which led to the expedient of a Constituent Convention. Cromwell told the story of this unlucky assembly some years after with an amusing frankness. "I will come and tell you a story of my own weakness and folly. And yet it was done in my simplicity—I dare avow it was. . . . It was thought then that men of our own judgment, who had fought in the wars, and were all of a piece on that account—why, surely, these men will hit it, and these men will do it to the purpose, whatever can be desired! And surely we did think, and I did think so—the more blame to me!" Of the hundred and fifty-six men, "faithful, fearing God, and hating covetousness," whose names were selected for this purpose by the Council of State, from lists furnished by the congregational churches, the bulk were men, like Ashley Cooper, of good blood and "free estates;" and the proportion of burgesses, such as the leather-merchant, Praise-God Barebones, whose name was eagerly seized on as a nickname for the body to which he belonged, seems to have been much the same as in earlier Parliaments. But the circumstances of their choice told fatally on the temper of its members. Cromwell himself, in the burst of rugged eloquence with which he welcomed their assembling, was carried away by a strange enthusiasm. "Convince the nation," he said, "that as men fearing God have fought them out of their bondage under the regal power, so men fearing God do now rule them in the fear of God. . . . Own your call, for it is of God: indeed, it is marvellous, and it hath been unprojected. . . . Never was a supreme power under such a way of owning God and being owned by Him." A spirit yet more enthusiastic at once appeared in the proceedings of the Convention. The resignation of their powers by Cromwell and the Council into its hands left it the one supreme authority; but by the instrument which convoked it provision had been made that this authority should be transferred in fifteen months to another assembly elected according to its directions. Its work was, in fact, to be that of a constituent assembly, paving the way for a Parliament on a really national basis; but the Convention put the largest construction on its commission, and boldly undertook the whole task of constitutional reform. Committees were appointed to consider the needs of the Church and the nation. The spirit of economy and honesty which pervaded the assembly appeared in its redress of the extravagance which prevailed in the civil service, and of the inequality of taxation. With a remarkable energy it undertook a host of reforms, for whose execution England has had to wait to our own day. The Long Parliament had shrunk from any reform of the Court of Chancery, where twenty-three thousand

July,
1653

were waiting unheard. The Convention proposed its abolition. Work of compiling a single code of laws, begun under the Long Parliament by a committee with Sir Matthew Hale at its head, again pushed forward. The frenzied alarm which these bold measures aroused among the lawyer class was soon backed by that clergy, who saw their wealth menaced by the establishment of marriage and by proposals to substitute the free contribution of congregations for the payment of tithes. The landed gentry too rose against the scheme for the abolition of lay-offices, which was favoured by the Convention, and predicted the age of confiscation. The "Barebones Parliament," as the assembly was styled in derision, was charged with a design to ruin property, the Church, and the law, with enmity to knowledge, and with ignorant fanaticism. Cromwell himself shared the general uneasiness at its proceedings. His mind was that of an administrator, rather than that of a statesman, unspeculative, prudent in foresight, conservative, and eminently practical. He had the need of administrative reform in Church and State; but he had no sympathy whatever with the revolutionary theories which were filling the air around him. His desire was for "a settlement," which should be accompanied with as little disturbance of the old state of things as possible. If Monarchy had vanished in the turmoil of war, his experience of the Long Parliament only confirmed him in his belief of the need of establishing an executive of a similar kind, apart from the power of the legislature, as a condition of civil liberty. His sword had won "liberty of conscience;" but passionately as he clung to it, he was still for an established Church, for a parochial system, and a ministry maintained by tithes. His social tendencies were simply those of the class to which he belonged. "I was by birth a gentleman," he told the Convention, and in the old social arrangement of "a nobleman, a gentleman, a yeoman," he saw "a good interest of the nation and a great one." He hated "that levelling principle" which tended to the reducing of all to one equality. "What was the purport of it," he asks with an amusing simplicity, "but to make the tenant as liberal a fortune as the landlord?"

A practical temper such as this the speculative reforms of the Convention were as distasteful as to the lawyers and clergy whom they attacked. "Nothing," said Cromwell, "was in the hearts of these men but 'overturn, overturn.'" But he was delivered from his embarrassment by the internal dissensions of the Assembly. The day after the decision against tithes the more conservative members snatched a vote by surprise "that the sitting Parliament any longer, as now constituted, will not be for the good of the Commonwealth, and that it is requisite to deliver up to the Lord-General the powers we received from him." The members placed their abdication in Cromwell's hands, and the act confirmed by the subsequent adhesion of a majority of the members. The dissolution of the Convention replaced matters in

1653
to
1660

The
New
Constitution

Dec.
1653

1653
to
1660

the state in which its assembly had found them; but there was still the same general anxiety to substitute some sort of legal rule for the power of the sword. The Convention had named during its session a fresh Council of State, and this body at once drew up, under the name of the Instrument of Government, a remarkable Constitution, which was adopted by the Council of Officers. They were driven by necessity to the step from which they had shrunk before, that of convening a Parliament on the reformed basis of representation. The House was to consist of four hundred members from England, thirty from Scotland, and thirty from Ireland. The seats hitherto assigned to small and rotten boroughs were transferred to larger constituencies, and for the most part to counties. All special rights of voting in the election of members was abolished, and replaced by a general right of suffrage, based on the possession of real or personal property to the value of two hundred pounds. Catholics and "Malignants," as those who had fought for the King were called, were alone excluded from the franchise. Constitutionally, all further organization of the form of government should have been left to this Assembly; but the dread of disorder during the interval of its election, as well as a longing for "settlement," drove the Council to complete their work by pressing the office of "Protector" upon Cromwell. "They told me that except I would undertake the government they thought things would hardly come to a composure or settlement, but blood and confusion would break in as before." If we follow, however, his own statement, it was when they urged that the acceptance of such a Protectorate actually limited his power as Lord-General, and "bound his hands to act nothing without the consent of a Council until the Parliament," that the post was accepted. The powers of the new Protector indeed were strictly limited. Though the members of the Council were originally named by him, each member was irremovable save by consent of the rest: their advice was necessary in all foreign affairs, their consent in matters of peace and war, their approval in nominations to the great offices of state, or the disposal of the military or civil power. With this body too lay the choice of all future Protectors. To the administrative check of the Council was added the political check of the Parliament. Three years at the most were to elapse between the assembling of one Parliament and another. Laws could not be made, nor taxes imposed but by its authority, and after the lapse of twenty days the statutes it passed became laws even if the Protector's assent was refused to them. The new Constitution was undoubtedly popular; and the promise of a real Parliament in a few months covered the want of any legal character in the new rule. The Government was generally accepted as a provisional one, which could only acquire legal authority from the ratification of its acts in the coming session; and the desire to settle it on such a Parliamentary basis was universal among the members of the new Assembly which met in the autumn at Westminster.

Sept.
1654

w Parliaments have ever been more memorable, or more truly representative of the English people, than the Parliament of 1654. It is the first Parliament in our history where members from Scotland and Ireland sat side by side with those from England, and they sit in the Parliament of to-day. The members for rotten boroughs and pocket-boroughs had disappeared. In spite of the exclusion of the Royalists from the polling-booths, and the very erasure of the names of a few ultra-republican members of the Council, the House had a better title to the name of a "free parliament" than any which had sat before. The freedom with which the electors had exercised their right of voting was soon found in the large number of Presbyterian members who were elected, and in the reappearance of Haselrig and Bradshaw, with other members of the Long Parliament, side by side with Lord Protector and the older Sir Harry Vane. The first business of the House was clearly to consider the question of government; and Haselrig, with the fiercer republicans, at once denied the legal existence of either Council or Protector, on the ground that the

1653
to
1660
—
Parliament of
1654

Parliament had never been dissolved. Such an argument, however, told as much against the Parliament in which they sat as against the administration itself, and the bulk of the Assembly contented themselves with declining to recognize the Constitution of the Protectorate as of more than provisional validity. They proceeded at once to settle the government on a Parliamentary basis. "Instrument" was taken as the groundwork of the new constitution, and carried clause by clause. That Cromwell should in his rule as Protector was unanimously agreed; that he should possess the right of veto or a co-ordinate legislative power over the Parliament was hotly debated, though the violent age of Haselrig did little to disturb the general tone of moderation. Suddenly, however, Cromwell interposed. If he had taken the duties of Protector with reluctance, he looked on the legal defects in his title as more than supplied by the general confidence of the nation. "I called not myself to this place," he said, "God and the people of these kingdoms have borne testimony to it." His rule had been accepted by London, by the army, by a solemn decision of the judges, by addresses from every shire, by the very appearance of the members of the Parliament in answer to his writ. "Why may I not balance this Providence," he asked, "by any hereditary interest?" In this national approval he saw the will of God, a Divine Right of a higher order than that of the monarch who had gone before. But there was another ground for the policy with which he watched the proceedings of the Commons. His passion for administration had far overstepped the bounds of a merely provisional rule in the interval before the assembling of a new Parliament. His desire for "settlement" had been strengthened not only by the drift of public opinion, but by the urgent need of the day; and the power reserved by the "Instrument" to issue emergency Ordinances, "until further order in such matters, to be

1658
to
1660

taken by the Parliament," gave a scope to his marvellous activity of which he at once took advantage. Sixty-four Ordinances had been issued in the nine months before the meeting of the Parliament. Peace had been concluded with Holland. The Church had been set in order. The law itself had been minutely regulated. The union with Scotland had been brought to completion. So far was Cromwell from dreaming that these measures, or the authority which enacted them, would be questioned, that he looked to Parliament simply to complete his work. "The great end of your meeting," he said at the first assembly of its members, "is healing and settling." Though he had himself done much, he added, "there was still much to be done." Peace had to be made with Portugal, and alliance with Spain. Bills were laid before the House for the codification of the law. The plantation and settlement of Ireland had still to be completed. He resented the setting these projects aside for constitutional questions which, as he held, a Divine call had decided, but he resented yet more the renewed claim advanced by Parliament to the sole power of legislation. As we have seen, his experience of the evils which had arisen from the concentration of legislative and executive power in the Long Parliament had convinced Cromwell of the danger to public liberty which lay in such a union. He saw in the joint government of "a single person and a Parliament" the only assurance "that Parliaments should not make themselves perpetual," or that their power should not be perverted to public wrong. But whatever strength there may have been in the Protector's arguments, the act by which he proceeded to enforce them was fatal to liberty, and in the end to Puritanism. "If my calling be from God," he ended, "and my testimony from the People, God and the People shall take it from me, else I will not part from it." And he announced that no member would be suffered to enter the House without signing an engagement "not to alter the Government as it is settled in a single person and a Parliament." No act of the Stuarts had been a bolder defiance of constitutional law; and the act was as needless as it was illegal. One hundred members alone refused to take the engagement, and the signatures of three-fourths of the House proved that the security Cromwell desired might have been easily procured by a vote of Parliament. But those who remained resumed their constitutional task with unbroken firmness. They quietly asserted their sole title to government by referring the Protector's Ordinances to Committees for revision, and for conversion into laws. The "Instrument of Government" was turned into a bill, debated, and read a third time. Money votes, as in previous Parliaments, were deferred till "grievances" had been settled. But Cromwell once more intervened. The Royalists were astir again; and he attributed their renewed hopes to the hostile attitude which he attributed to the Parliament. The army, which remained unpaid while the supplies were delayed, was seething with discontent. "It looks," said the Protector, "as if the

grounds for a quarrel had rather been designed than to the people settlement. Judge yourselves whether the con-
g of things that were provided for by this government hath
profitable expense of time for the good of this nation." In
of angry reproach he declared the Parliament dissolved.

1653
to
1660
—
Jan.
1655

th the dissolution of the Parliament of 1654 ended all show of
rule. The Protectorate, deprived by its own act of all chance
al sanction, became a simple tyranny. Cromwell professed,
d, to be restrained by the "Instrument;" but the one great
int on his power which the Instrument provided, the inability
y taxes save by consent of Parliament, was set aside on the
f necessity. "The People," said the Protector in words which
ord might have uttered, "will prefer their real security to
." That a danger of Royalist revolt existed was undeniable,
he danger was at once doubled by the general discontent.

The
New
Tyranny

at this moment, Whitelock tells us, "many sober and noble
sts," in despair of public liberty, "did begin to incline to the
s restoration." In the mass of the population the reaction
ar more rapid. "Charles Stuart," writes a Cheshire corre-
lent to the Secretary of State, "hath five hundred friends in
adjacent counties for every one friend to you among them."

before the overpowering strength of the army even this general
otent was powerless. Yorkshire, where the Royalist insur-
on was expected to be most formidable, never ventured to
it all. There were risings in Devon, Dorset, and the Welsh
hes, but they were quickly put down, and their leaders brought
e scaffold. Easily however as the revolt was suppressed, the
r of the Government was seen in the energetic measures to
y Cromwell resorted in the hope of securing order. The
ry was divided into ten military governments, each with a
r-general at its head, who was empowered to disarm all Papists
Royalists, and to arrest suspected persons. Funds for the sup-
of this military despotism were provided by an Ordinance of the
oil of State, which enacted that all who had at any time borne

for the King should pay every year a tenth part of their
ne, in spite of the Act of Oblivion, as a fine for their Royalist
ancies. The despotism of the major-generals was seconded by
lder expedients of tyranny. The Episcopalian clergy had been
us in promoting the insurrection, and they were forbidden in
ge to act as ministers or as tutors. The press was placed
r a strict censorship. The payment of taxes levied by the sole
rity of the Protector was enforced by distraint; and when a
tor was sued in the courts for redress, the counsel for the
eution were sent to the Tower.

pardon, indeed, could ever be won for a tyranny, the wisdom
grandeur with which he used the power he had usurped would
pardon for the Protector. The greatest among the many great
prises undertaken by the Long Parliament had been the
n of the three Kingdoms: and that of Scotland with England

Scotland
and
Ireland

1653
to
1660

had been brought about, at the very end of its career, by the tact and vigour of Sir Harry Vane. But its practical realization was left to Cromwell. In four months of hard fighting General Monk brought the Highlands to a new tranquillity; and the presence of an army of seven thousand men, backed by a line of forts, kept the most restless of the clans in good order. The settlement of the country was brought about by the temperance and sagacity of Monk's successor, General Deane. No further interference with the Presbyterian system was attempted beyond the suppression of the General Assembly. But religious liberty was resolutely protected, and Deane ventured even to interfere on behalf of the miserable victims whom Scotch bigotry was torturing and burning on the charge of witchcraft. Even steady Royalists acknowledged the justice of the Government and the wonderful discipline of its troops. "We always reckon those eight years of the usurpation," said Burnet afterwards, "a time of great peace and prosperity." Sterner work had to be done before Ireland could be brought into real union with its sister kingdoms. The work of conquest had been continued by Ireton, and completed after his death by General Ludlow, as mercilessly as it had begun. Thousands perished by famine or the sword. Shipload after shipload of those who surrendered were sent over sea for sale into forced labour in Jamaica and the West Indies. More than forty thousand of the beaten Catholics were permitted to enlist for foreign service, and found a refuge in exile under the banners of France and Spain. The work of settlement, which was undertaken by Henry Cromwell, the younger and abler of the Protector's sons, turned out to be even more terrible than the work of the sword. It took as its model the Colonization of Ulster, the fatal measure which had destroyed all hope of a united Ireland and had brought inevitably in its train the massacre and the war. The people were divided into classes in the order of their assumed guilt. All who after fair trial were proved to have personally taken part in the massacre were sentenced to banishment or death. The general amnesty which freed "those of the meaner sort" from all question on other scores was far from extending to the landowners. Catholic proprietors who had shown no goodwill to the Parliament, even though they had taken no part in the war, were punished by the forfeiture of a third of their estates. All who had borne arms were held to have forfeited the whole, and driven into Connaught, where fresh estates were carved out for them from the lands of the native clans. No such doom had ever fallen on a nation in modern times as fell upon Ireland in its new settlement. Among the bitter memories which part Ireland from England the memory of the bloodshed and confiscation which the Puritans wrought remains the bitterest; and the worst curse an Irish peasant can hurl at his enemy is "the curse of Cromwell." But pitiless as the Protector's policy was, it was successful in the ends at which it aimed. The whole native population lay helpless and crushed. Peace and order were restored,

large incoming of Protestant settlers from England and brought a new prosperity to the wasted country. Above the legislative union which had been brought about with and was now carried out with Ireland, and thirty seats were added to its representatives in the general Parliament.

England Cromwell dealt with the Royalists as irreconcilable enemies; but in every other respect he carried fairly out his pledge of healing and settling." The series of administrative reforms ordered by the Convention had been partially carried into effect at the meeting of Parliament in 1654; but the work was pushed after the dissolution of the House with yet greater energy. By a hundred Ordinances showed the industry of the Govern-

Police, public amusements, roads, finances, the condition of prisons, the imprisonment of debtors, were a few among the subjects which claimed Cromwell's attention. An Ordinance of more than 100 clauses reformed the Court of Chancery. The anarchy which reigned in the Church since the break down of Episcopacy and failure of the Presbyterian system to supply its place, was put to rest by a series of wise and temperate measures for its reorganization. Rights of patronage were left untouched; but a list of Triers, a fourth of whom were laymen, was appointed to examine the fitness of ministers presented to livings; and a Church of gentry and clergy was set up in every county to exercise supervision over ecclesiastical affairs, and to detect and remove idle and ineffectual ministers. Even by the confession of Cromwell's opponents, the plan worked well. It furnished the country with "able, serious preachers," Baxter tells us, "who lived a sober life, of what tolerable opinion soever they were," and, whether Presbyterian and Independent ministers were presented to livings at the will of their patrons, it solved so far as practical working was concerned the problem of a religious union of Protestants on the base of a wide variety of Christian opinion. From the Church which was thus reorganized all power of interference with faiths differing from its own was resolutely withheld. Cromwell remained true throughout to his great cause of religious liberty. Even the Quaker, rejected by all other Christians as an anarchist and blasphemer, found sympathy and protection in Cromwell. The Jews had been excluded from England since the reign of Edward the First; and a prayer which they now presented for leave to return was refused by the commission of judges and divines to whom the Protector referred it for consideration. But the refusal was quietly passed over, and the advance of Cromwell in the settlement of a few Hebrews in London and Oxford was so clearly understood that no one ventured to interfere with them.

One part of his policy is more characteristic of Cromwell's mind, stronger in its strength or in its weakness, than his management of foreign affairs. While England had been absorbed in her long and arduous struggle for freedom the whole face of the world around

1653
to
1660

England
and the
Protectorate

Crom-
well and
Europe

1653
to
1660

her had changed. The Thirty Years' War was over. The victories of Gustavus, and of the Swedish generals who followed him, had been seconded by the policy of Richelieu and the intervention of France. Protestantism in Germany was no longer in peril from the bigotry or ambition of the House of Austria; and the Treaty of Westphalia had drawn a permanent line between the territories belonging to the adherents of the old religion and the new. There was little danger, indeed, now to Europe from the great Catholic House which had threatened its freedom ever since Charles the Fifth. Its Austrian branch was called away from dreams of aggression in the west to a desperate struggle with the Turk for the possession of Hungary and the security of Austria itself. Spain, from causes which it is no part of our present story to detail, was falling into a state of strange decrepitude. So far from aiming to be mistress of Europe, she was rapidly sinking into the almost helpless prey of France. It was France which had become the dominant power in Christendom, though her position was far from being as commanding as it was to become under Lewis the Fourteenth. The peace and order which prevailed after the cessation of the religious troubles throughout her compact and fertile territory gave scope at last to the quick and industrious temper of the French people; while her wealth and energy was placed by the centralizing administration of Henry the Fourth, of Richelieu, and of Mazarin, almost absolutely in the hands of the Crown. Under the three great rulers who have just been named her ambition was steadily directed to the same purpose of territorial aggrandizement, and though limited as yet to the annexation of the Spanish and Imperial territories, which still parted her frontier from the Pyrenees, the Alps, and the Rhine, a statesman of wise political genius would have discerned the beginning of that great struggle for supremacy over Europe at large which was only foiled by the genius of Marlborough and the victories of the Grand Alliance. But in his view of European politics Cromwell was misled by the conservative and unspeculative temper of his mind as well as by the strength of his religious enthusiasm. Of the change in the world around him he seems to have discerned nothing. He brought to the Europe of Mazarin simply the hopes and ideas with which all England was thrilling in his youth at the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War. Spain was still to him "the head of the Papal Interest," whether at home or abroad. "The Papists in England," he said to the Parliament of 1656, "have been accounted, ever since I was born, Spaniolized; they never regarded France, or any other Papist state, but Spain only." The old English hatred of Spain, the old English resentment at the shameful part which the nation had been forced to play in the great German struggle by the policy of James and of Charles, lived on in Cromwell, and was only strengthened by the religious enthusiasm which the success of Puritanism had kindled within him. "The Lord Himself," he wrote to his admirals as they sailed to the West Indies, "hath a

oversy with your enemies; even with that Romish Babylon which the Spaniard is the great underpropper. In that respect might the Lord's battles." What Sweden had been under Charles, England, Cromwell dreamt, might be now—the head of the Protestant League in the struggle against Catholic aggression.

1653
to
1660

"You have on your shoulders," he said to the Parliament of England, "the interest of all the Christian people of the world. I wish it may be written on our hearts to be zealous for that interest."

The first step in such a struggle would necessarily be to league the Protestant powers together, and Cromwell's earliest efforts were directed to bring the ruinous and indecisive quarrel with Holland to an end.

The fierceness of the strife had grown with each engagement; but the hopes of Holland fell with her admiral, Tromp, who received a mortal wound at the moment when he had succeeded in forcing the English line; and the skill and energy of his successor, De Ruyter, struggled in vain to restore her waning fortunes.

1653

England was saved by the expulsion of the Long Parliament, which persisted in its demand of a political union of the two countries; but the new policy of Cromwell was seen in the conclusion of a truce on a simple pledge from the Dutch to compensate English merchants for their losses in the war. The peace with Holland followed by the conclusion of like treaties with Sweden and

1654

Denmark; and on the arrival of a Swedish envoy with offers of league of friendship, Cromwell endeavoured to bring the Dutch, Brandenburgers, and the Danes into the same confederation of Protestant powers. His efforts in this direction, though they were wholly ceased, were foiled for the moment; but Cromwell was resolute to kindle again the religious strife which had been quenched by the treaty of Westphalia, and he seized on a quarrel between the Duke of Savoy and his Protestant subjects in the County of Piedmont as a means of kindling it. A ruthless massacre of Vaudois by the Duke's troops had roused deep resentment throughout England, a resentment which still breathes in the poetry of Milton's sonnets. While the poet called on God to avenge "slaughtered saints whose bones lie scattered on the Alpine mountains cold," Cromwell was already busy with the work of holy vengeance. An English envoy appeared at the Duke's court with haughty demands of redress. Their refusal would have

been followed by instant war, for the Protestant Cantons of the Netherlands were bribed into promising a force of ten thousand men for an attack on Savoy; and how far Cromwell expected the war to spread was seen in his attitude towards Spain. He had already demanded freedom of trade and worship for English merchants in Spanish America; and a fleet with three thousand men on board was now secretly dispatched against San Domingo. It was thought to announce the outbreak of a world-wide struggle, and it appeared in the Mediterranean, bombarded Algiers, and employed the fleet with which its pirates had ventured through the reign of Charles to insult the English coast. The thunder of his

1655

1653
to
1660

guns, every Puritan believed, would be heard in the castle of St. Angelo, and Rome itself would have to bow to the greatness of Cromwell. But the vast schemes of the Protector everywhere broke down. The cool Italian who ruled France, Cardinal Mazarin, foiled his projects in Piedmont by forcing the Duke of Savoy to grant the English demands. Blake, who had sailed to the Spanish coast, failed to intercept the treasure fleet from America, and the West Indian expedition was foiled in its descent on San Domingo. Its conquest of Jamaica, important as it really was in breaking through the monopoly of the New World in the South which Spain had till now enjoyed, seemed at the time but a poor result for the vast expenditure of money and blood. The war which the attack on San Domingo necessarily brought on saw the last and grandest of the triumphs of England's first great admiral. Blake found the Plata fleet guarded by galleons in the strongly armed harbour of Santa Cruz. He forced an entrance into the harbour, sunk or burnt every ship in it, and worked his fleet out again in the midst of a gale. His death, as the fleet touched at Plymouth on its return, alone damped the joy at this great victory. But Cromwell desired triumphs on land as on sea; and his desire threw him blindfold into the hands of Mazarin, who was engaged on his part in the war with Spain which was brought afterwards to a close in the Treaty of the Pyrenees. Cromwell's demand of Dunkirk, which had long stood in the way of any acceptance of his offers of aid, was at last conceded; and a detachment of the Puritan army joined the French troops who were attacking Flanders under the command of Turenne. Their valour and discipline was shown by the part they took in the victory of the Dunes, a victory which forced the Flemish towns to open their gates to the French, and gave Dunkirk to Cromwell.

1657

1658

The
Parliament of
1657

Never had the fame of England stood higher; and yet never had any English ruler committed so fatal a blunder as that of Cromwell in aiding the ambition of France. But the errors of his foreign policy were small in comparison with the errors of his policy at home. The government of the Protector had become a simple tyranny, but it was impossible for him to remain content with the position of a tyrant. He was as anxious as ever to give a legal basis to his administration; and he seized on the war as a pretext for again summoning a Parliament. But he no longer trusted, as in the Parliament of 1654, to perfect freedom of election. The sixty members sent from Ireland and Scotland were simply nominees of the Government. Its whole influence was exerted to secure the return of the more conspicuous members of the Council. All Catholics, and all Royalists who had actually fought for the King, were still disqualified from voting. It was calculated that of the members returned one-half were bound to the Government by ties of profit or place. But Cromwell was still unsatisfied. A certificate of the Council was required from each member before admission to the House; and a fourth of the whole number returned—one

rep.
1658

ered in all, with Haselrig at their head—were by this means uded on grounds of disaffection or want of religion. To these trary acts of violence the House replied only by a course of ular moderation and wisdom. From the first it disclaimed any ose of opposing the Government. One of its earliest acts ided securities for Cromwell's person, which was threatened onstant plots of assassination. It supported him in his war cy, and voted supplies of unprecedented extent for the main- nce of the struggle. It was this attitude of loyalty which gave e to its steady refusal to sanction the system of tyranny h had practically placed England under martial law. In his ing address Cromwell boldly took his stand in support of the ary despotism wielded by the major-generals. "It hath been e effectual towards the discountenancing of vice and settling gon than anything done these fifty years. I will abide by it," aid, with singular vehemence, "notwithstanding the envy and der of foolish men. I could as soon venture my life with it as anything I ever undertook. If it were to be done again, I ld do it." But no sooner had a bill been introduced into Parlia- t to confirm the proceedings of the major-generals than a long ate showed the temper of the Commons. They had resolved to nesce in the Protectorate, but they were equally resolved to g it again to a legal mode of government. This indeed was the of even Cromwell's wiser adhreents. "What makes me fear passing of this Act," one of them wrote to his son Henry. "is , thereby His Highness' government will be more founded in e, and more removed from that natural foundation which the ple in Parliament are desirous to give him, supposing that he become more theirs than now he is." The bill was rejected, Cromwell bowed to the feeling of the nation by withdrawing powers of the major-generals. But the defeat of the tyranny he sword was only a step towards a far bolder effort for the oration of the power of the law. It was no mere pedantry, still was it vulgar flattery, which influenced the Parliament in their r to Cromwell of the title of King. The experience of the last years had taught the nation the value of the traditional forms or which its liberties had grown up. A king was limited by titutional precedents. "The king's prerogative," it was well ad, "is under the courts of justice, and is bounded as well as acre of land, or anything a man hath." A Protector, on the or hand, was new in our history, and there were no traditional ns of limiting his power. "The one office being lawful in its re," said Glynne, "known to the nation, certain in itself, and ined and regulated by the law, and the other not so—that was great ground why the Parliament did so much insist on this e and title." Under the name of Monarchy, indeed, the question ly at issue between the party headed by the officers and the y led by the lawyers in the Commons was that of the restora- of constitutional and legal rule. The proposal was carried by

1653

1660

1653
to
1660
—
1657

an overwhelming majority, but a month passed in endless consultations between the Parliament and the Protector. His good sense, his knowledge of the general feeling of the nation, his real desire to obtain a settlement which should secure the ends for which Puritanism had fought, political and religious liberty, broke, in conference after conference, through a mist of words. But his real concern throughout was with the temper of the army. To Cromwell his soldiers were no common swordsmen. They were "godly men, men that will not be beaten down by a worldly and carnal spirit while they keep their integrity;" men in whose general voice he recognized the voice of God. "They are honest and faithful men," he urged, "true to the great things of the Government. And though it really is no part of their goodness to be unwilling to submit to what a Parliament shall settle over them, yet it is my duty and conscience to beg of you that there may be no hard things put upon them which they cannot swallow. I cannot think God would bless an undertaking of anything which would justly and with cause grieve them." The temper of the army was soon shown. Its leaders, with Lambert, Fleetwood, and Desborough at their head, placed their commands in Cromwell's hands. A petition from the officers to Parliament demanded the withdrawal of the proposal to restore the Monarchy, "in the name of the old cause for which they had bled." Cromwell at once anticipated the coming debate on this petition, a debate which might have led to an open breach between the army and the Commons, by a refusal of the Crown. "I cannot undertake this Government," he said, "with that title of King; and that is my answer to this great and weighty business."

Disappointed as it was, the Parliament with singular self-restraint turned to other modes of bringing about its purpose. The offer of the Crown had been coupled with the condition of accepting a Constitution, which was a modification of the Instrument of Government adopted by the Parliament of 1654, and this Constitution Cromwell emphatically approved. "The things provided by this Act of Government," he owned, "do secure the liberties of the people of God as they never before have had them." With a change of the title of King into that of Protector, the Act of Government now became law: and the solemn inauguration of the Protector by the Parliament was a practical acknowledgment on the part of Cromwell of the illegality of his former rule. In the name of the Commons the Speaker invested him with a mantle of State, placed the sceptre in his hand, and girt the sword of justice by his side. By the new Act of Government Cromwell was allowed to name his own successor, but in all after cases the office was to be an elective one. In every other respect the forms of the older Constitution were carefully restored. Parliament was again to consist of two Houses, the seventy members of "the other House" being named by the Protector. The Commons regained their old right of exclusively deciding on the qualification of their members. Parliamentary restrictions were imposed on the choice of members

the Council, and officers of State or of the army. A fixed revenue was voted to the Protector, and it was provided that no moneys should be raised but by assent of Parliament. Liberty of worship was secured for all but Papists, Prelatists, Socinians, or those who denied the inspiration of the Scriptures; and liberty of conscience was secured for all.

1653
to
1660

the excluded members were again admitted when the Parliament reassembled after an adjournment of six months; and the very act of Cromwell in giving his nominees in "the other House" the title of Lords kindled a quarrel which was busily fanned by intrigues. But while the Houses were busy with their squabble the time of death was falling on the Protector. He had long been weary of his task. "God knows," he burst out a little time before he met the Parliament, "I would have been glad to have lived under a good government, and to have kept a flock of sheep, rather than to have undertaken this government." And now to the weariness of power was added the weakness and feverish impatience of disease. Cromwell was vigorous and energetic as his life had seemed, his health was by no means as strong as his will; he had been struck down by intermittent fever in the midst of his triumphs both in Scotland and in Ireland, and during the past year he had suffered from repeated attacks of it. "I have some infirmities upon me," he owned twice in his speech at the opening of the Parliament; and his nervous irritability was quickened by the public danger. No resolutions had been voted, and the pay of the army was heavily in arrears, while its temper grew more and more sullen at the appearance of the new Constitution and the reawakening of the Royalist intrigues. The continuance of the Parliamentary strife threw Cromwell at last, says an observer at this court, "into a rage and on like unto madness." Summoning his coach, by a sudden impulse, the Protector drove with a few guards to Westminster; setting aside the remonstrances of Fleetwood, summoned the Houses to his presence. "I do dissolve this Parliament," he said in a speech of angry rebuke, "and let God be judge between me and me." Fatal as was the error, for the moment all went well.

Death of
Crom-
well

Feb.
1658

The army was reconciled by the blow levelled at its opponents, the few murmurers were weeded from its ranks by a careful culling. The triumphant officers vowed to stand or fall with the Protector. The danger of a Royalist rising vanished before a flood of addresses from the counties. Great news too came from abroad, where victory in Flanders, and the cession of Dunkirk, were the seal on Cromwell's glory. But the fever crept steadily on, his looks told the tale of death to the Quaker, Fox, who met him riding in Hampton Court Park. "Before I came to him," he said, "as he rode at the head of his Life Guards, I saw and felt a sense of death go forth against him, and when I came to him he looked like a dead man." In the midst of his triumph Cromwell's mind was in fact heavy with the sense of failure. He had no desire to be the tyrant; nor had he any belief in the permanence of a

1653
to
1660

more tyranny. He had hardly dissolved the Parliament before he was planning the summons of another, and angry at the opposition which his Council offered to the project. "I will take my own resolutions," he said gloomily to his household; "I can no longer satisfy myself to sit still, and make myself guilty of the loss of all the honest party and of the nation itself." But before his plans could be realized the overtaxed strength of the Protector suddenly gave way. He saw too clearly the chaos into which his death would plunge England to be willing to die. "Do not think I shall die," he burst out with feverish energy to the physicians who gathered round him; "say not I have lost my reason! I tell you the truth. I know it from better authority than any you can have from Galen or Hippocrates. It is the answer of God himself to our prayers!" Prayer indeed rose from every side for his recovery, but death drew steadily nearer, till even Cromwell felt that his hour was come. "I would be willing to live," the dying man murmured, "to be further serviceable to God and his people, but my work is done! Yet God will be with his people!" A storm which tore roofs from houses, and levelled huge trees in every forest, seemed a fitting prelude to the passing away of his mighty spirit. Three days later, on the third of September, the day which had witnessed his victories of Worcester and Dunbar, Cromwell quietly breathed his last.

The
Fall of
Puri-
tanism

So absolute even in death was his sway over the minds of men, that, to the wonder of the excited Royalists, even a doubtful nomination on his death-bed was enough to secure the peaceful succession of his son, Richard Cromwell. Many, in fact, who had rejected the authority of his father submitted peaceably to the new Protector. Their motives were explained by Baxter, the most eminent among the Presbyterian ministers, in the address to Richard which announced his adhesion. "I observe," he says, "that the nation generally rejoice in your peaceable entrance upon the Government. Many are persuaded that you have been strangely kept from participating in any of our late bloody contentions, that God might make you the healer of our breaches, and employ you in that Temple work which David himself might not be honoured with, though it was in his mind, because he shed blood abundantly and made great wars." The new Protector was a weak and worthless man, but the bulk of the nation were content to be ruled by one who was at any rate no soldier, no Puritan, and no innovator. Richard was known to be lax and godless in his conduct, and he was believed to be conservative and even Royalist in heart. The tide of reaction was felt even in his Council. Their first act was to throw aside one of the greatest of Cromwell's reforms, and to fall back in the summons which they issued for the new Parliament on the old system of election. It was felt far more keenly in the tone of the new House of Commons. The republicans under Vane, backed adroitly by the Royalists, fell hotly on Cromwell's system. The fiercest attack of all came from Sir Ashley Cooper, a Dorset-

re gentleman who had changed sides in the civil war, had fought the King and then for the Parliament, had been a member of Cromwell's Council, and had of late ceased to be a member of it. A virulent invective on "his Highness of deplorable memory, who with fraud and force deprived you of your liberty when living and entailed slavery on you at his death," was followed by an equally virulent invective against the army. "They have not only subdued their enemies," said Cooper, "but the masters who raised and maintained them! They have not only conquered Scotland and Ireland, but rebellious England too; and there suppressed a malignant party of magistrates and laws." The army was quick to its reply. The Council of its officers demanded the appointment of a soldier as their General in the place of the new Protector, who had assumed the command. The Commons at once ordered the dismissal of all officers who refused to engage "not to disturb or interrupt the free meetings of Parliament;" and Richard Cromwell ordered the Council of Officers to dissolve. Their reply was a demand for the dissolution of the Parliament, a demand with which Richard was forced to comply. The great work of the army never was still to secure a settled government, and setting aside the new Protector, whose weakness was now evident, they resolved to call all back on the Parliament they had expelled from St. Stephen's, which remained the one body that could put forward a legitimate claim to power. Of the one hundred and sixty members who continued to sit after the King's death, about ninety returned to their seats, and resumed the administration of affairs. But the memory of the Expulsion made any trust in or reconciliation with the army impossible. In spite of Vane's counsels a reform of the officers was at once proposed, and though a Royalist rising in Wiltshire under Sir George Booth threw the disputants for a moment to one side, the struggle revived as the danger passed away. A new war indeed filled men's minds. Not only was the nation sick of military rule, but the army, unconquerable so long as it held together, at last showed signs of division; and Haselrig was enraged by the temper of the troops in Scotland and Ireland to demand the dismissal of Fleetwood and Lambert from their commands. They answered by driving the Parliament again from Westminster, and by marching to meet the army under Monk, which was threatening to advance from Scotland to the South. Negotiation gave Monk time to gather a Convention at Edinburgh, to strengthen himself with money and recruits. Then he advanced rapidly to Coldstream, and the cry of "a free Parliament" ran like fire through the country. Not only Fairfax, who had been in arms in Yorkshire, but the ships on the Thames, and the mob which thronged the streets of London caught up the cry; the army, thrown into confusion by its own divisions, strove to keep the tide of feeling by recalling the Commons; and Monk, who lavished protestations of loyalty to that assembly, while he accepted petitions for a "Free Parliament," entered London

1653
to
1660

1659

1660

1653
to
1660

unopposed. From the moment of his entry the restoration of the Stuarts became inevitable. The army, resolute as it still remained for the maintenance of "the Cause," was deceived by Monk's declarations of loyalty to it, and rendered powerless by an adroit dispersion of the troops over the country. At the instigation of Ashley Cooper those who remained of the members who had been excluded from the House of Commons by Pride's Purge again forced their way into Parliament, and at once resolved on a dissolution and the election of a new House of Commons. The new House, which bears the name of the Convention, had hardly taken the solemn League and Covenant which showed its Presbyterian temper, and its leaders had only begun to draw up terms on which a Royal restoration might be assented to, when they found that Monk had betrayed them, and was already in negotiation with the exiled Court. All exaction of terms was now impossible; the Declaration of Breda, in which Charles promised a general pardon, religious toleration, and satisfaction to the army, was received with a burst of national enthusiasm; and the old Constitution was restored by a solemn vote of the Convention, "that according to the ancient and fundamental laws of this Kingdom, the government is, and ought to be, by King, Lords, and Commons." The vote was hardly passed when Charles landed at Dover, and made his way amidst the shouts of a great multitude to Whitehall. "It is my own fault," laughed the new King, with characteristic irony, "that I had not come back sooner; for I find nobody who does not tell me he has always longed for my return."

May,
1660

Milton

Puritanism, so men believed, had fallen never to rise again. As a political experiment it had ended in utter failure and disgust. As a religious system of national life it brought about the wildest outbreak of moral revolt that England has ever witnessed. And yet Puritanism was far from being dead; it drew indeed a nobler life from its very fall. Nothing aids us better to trace the real course of Puritan influence since the fall of Puritanism than the thought of the two great works which have handed down from one generation to another its highest and noblest spirit. From that time to this the most popular of all religious books has been the Puritan allegory of the "Pilgrim's Progress." The most popular of all English poems has been the Puritan epic of the "Paradise Lost." Milton had been engaged during the civil war in strife with Presbyterians and with Royalists, pleading for civil and religious freedom, for freedom of social life, and freedom of the press. At a later time he became Latin Secretary to the Protector, in spite of a blindness which had been brought on by the intensity of his study. The Restoration found him of all living men the most hateful to the Royalists; for it was his "Defence of the English People" which had justified throughout Europe the execution of the King. Parliament ordered his book to be burnt by the common hangman; he was for a time imprisoned, and even when released he had to live amidst threats of assassination from fanatical Cavaliers. To

1653
to
1660

the ruin of his cause were added personal misfortunes in the bankruptcy of the scrivener who held the bulk of his property, and in the Fire of London, which deprived him of much of what was left. As age drew on, he found himself reduced to comparative poverty, and driven to sell his library for subsistence. Even among the sectaries who shared his political opinions Milton stood in religious union alone, for he had gradually severed himself from every accepted form of faith, had embraced Arianism, and had ceased to attend at any place of worship. Nor was his home a happy one. The grace and geniality of his youth disappeared in the drudgery of schoolmaster's life and amongst the invectives of controversy.

As age his temper became stern and exacting. His daughters, who were forced to read to their blind father in languages which they could not understand, revolted utterly against their bondage. But solitude and misfortune only brought out into bolder relief Milton's inner greatness. There was a grand simplicity in the life of his later years. He listened every morning to a chapter of the Hebrew Bible, and after musing in silence for a while pursued his studies till mid-day. Then he took exercise for an hour, played for another hour on the organ or viol, and renewed his studies. The evening was spent in converse with visitors and friends. For lonely and unpopular as Milton was, there was one thing about him which made his house in Bunhill Fields a place of pilgrimage to the wits of the Restoration. He was the last of the Elizabethans. He had possibly seen Shakspeare, as on his visits to London after his retirement to Stratford the playwright passed along Bread Street to his combat at the Mermaid. He had been the contemporary of Webster and Massinger, of Herrick and Crashaw. His "Comus" and "Arcades" had rivalled the masques of Ben Jonson. It was with a reverence drawn from thoughts like these that Dryden looked on the blind poet as he sate, clad in black, in his chamber hung with rusty green tapestry, his fair brown hair falling as of yore over a calm, serene face that still retained much of its youthful beauty, his cheeks delicately coloured, his clear grey eyes showing no trace of their blindness. But famous, whether for good or ill, as his prose writings had made him, during fifteen years only a few moments had broken his silence as a singer. It was now, in his oldness and old age, with the cause he loved trodden under foot by men as vile as the rabble in "Comus," that the genius of Milton took refuge in the great poem on which through years of silence his imagination had still been brooding.

On his return from his travels in Italy, Milton spoke of himself as musing on "a work not to be raised from the heat of youth or the vapours of wine, like that which flows as waste from the pen of some vulgar amourist or the trencher fury of a rhyming parasite, nor to be obtained by the invocation of Dame Memory and her seven daughters; but by devout prayer to that Eternal Spirit who enricheth with all utterance and knowledge, and sends out his raptim, with the hallowed fire of his altar, to touch and purify

The
Paradise
Lost

1653
to
1660
—
1667
1671

the lips of whom He pleases." His lips were touched at last. Seven years after the Restoration appeared the "Paradise Lost," and four years later the "Paradise Regained" and "Samson Agonistes," in the severe grandeur of whose verse we see the poet himself "fallen," like Samson, "on evil days and evil tongues, with darkness and with danger compassed round." But great as the two last works were, their greatness was eclipsed by that of their predecessor. The whole genius of Milton expressed itself in the "Paradise Lost." The romance, the gorgeous fancy, the daring imagination which he shared with the Elizabethan poets, the large but ordered beauty of form which he had drunk in from the literature of Greece and Rome, the sublimity of conception, the loftiness of phrase which he owed to the Bible, blended in this story "of man's first disobedience, and the fruit of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste brought death into the world and all our woe." It is only when we review the strangely mingled elements which make up the poem, that we realize the genius which fused them into such a perfect whole. The meagre outline of the Hebrew legend is lost in the splendour and music of Milton's verse. The stern idealism of Geneva is clothed in the gorgeous robes of the Renaissance. If we miss something of the free play of Spenser's fancy, and yet more of the imaginative delight in their own creations which gives so exquisite a life to the poetry of the early dramatists, we find in place of these the noblest example which our literature affords of the ordered majesty of classic form. But it is not with the literary value of the "Paradise Lost" that we are here concerned. Its historic importance lies in this, that it is the Epic of Puritanism. Its scheme is the problem with which the Puritan wrestled in hours of gloom and darkness, the problem of sin and redemption, of the world-wide struggle of evil against good. The intense moral concentration of the Puritan had given an almost bodily shape to spiritual abstractions before Milton gave life and being to the forms of Sin and Death. It was the Puritan tendency to mass into one vast "body of sin" the various forms of human evil, and by the very force of a passionate hatred to exaggerate their magnitude and their power, to which we owe the conception of Milton's Satan. The greatness of the Puritan aim in the long and wavering struggle for justice and law and a higher good; the grandeur of character which the contest developed; the colossal forms of good and evil which moved over its stage; the debates and conspiracies and battles which had been men's life for twenty years; the mighty eloquence and mightier ambition which the war had roused into being—all left their mark on the "Paradise Lost." Whatever was highest and best in the Puritan temper spoke in the nobleness and elevation of the poem, in its purity of tone, in its grandeur of conception, in its ordered and equable realization of a great purpose. Even in his boldest flights, Milton is calm and master of himself. His touch is always sure. Whether he passes from Heaven to Hell, or from the council hall

1653
to
1660

Satan to the sweet conference of Adam and Eve, his tread is ady and unfaltering. But if the poem expresses the higher alities of the Puritan temper, it expresses no less exactly its ects. Throughout it we feel almost painfully a want of the finer d subtler sympathies, of a large and genial humanity, of a sense spiritual mystery. Dealing as Milton does with subjects the st awful and mysterious that poet ever chose, he is never umbled by the obstinate questionings of invisible things which inted the imagination of Shakspeare. We look in vain for any schylean background of the vast unknown. "Man's dis- edience" and the scheme for man's redemption are laid down clearly and with just as little mystery as in a Puritan discourse.

Topics such as these, even God the Father (to borrow Pope's er) "turns a school divine." As in his earlier poems he had lered and arranged nature, so in the "Paradise Lost" Milton lers and arranges Heaven and Hell. His mightiest figures, Angel Archangel, Satan or Belial, stand out colossal but distinct. ere is just as little of the wide sympathy with all that is human ich is so loveable in Chaucer and Shakspeare. On the contrary Puritan individuality is nowhere so overpowering as in Milton. leaves the stamp of himself deeply graven on all he creates. We r his voice in every line of his poem. The cold, severe con- tion of moral virtue which reigns throughout it, the intellectual y in which he paints and regards beauty (for the beauty of Eve , beauty which no mortal man may love) are Milton's own. We l his inmost temper in the stoical self-repression which gives dignity to his figures. Adam utters no cry of agony when he riven from Paradise. Satan suffers in a defiant silence. It is this intense self-concentration that we must attribute the ange deficiency of humour which Milton shared with the itans generally, and which here and there breaks the sublimity is poem with strange slips into the grotesque. But it is above to this Puritan deficiency in human sympathy that we must ribute his wonderful want of dramatic genius. Of the power ich creates a thousand different characters, which endows each h its appropriate act and word, which loses itself in its own ations, no great poet ever had less.

The poem of Milton was the epic of a fallen cause. The broken Disband-
oe, which had seen the Kingdom of the Saints pass like a dream ing of
ay, spoke in its very name. Paradise was lost once more, when the Army

New Model, which embodied the courage and the hope of Puri- ism, laid down its arms. In his progress to the capital Charles sed in review the soldiers assembled on Blackheath. Betrayed their general, abandoned by their leaders, surrounded as they e by a nation in arms, the gloomy silence of their ranks awed n the careless King with a sense of danger. But none of the ories of the New Model were so glorious as the victory which von over itself. Quietly, and without a struggle, as men who ed to the inscrutable will of God, the farmers and traders who

1653
to
1680

had dashed Rupert's chivalry to pieces on Naseby field, who had scattered at Worcester the "army of the aliens," and driven into helpless flight the sovereign that now came "to enjoy his own again," who had renewed beyond sea the glories of Cressy and Agincourt, had mastered the Parliament, had brought a King to justice and the block, had given laws to England, and held even Cromwell in awe, became farmers and traders again, and were known among their fellow-men by no other sign than their greater soberness and industry. And, with them, Puritanism laid down the sword. It ceased from the long attempt to build up a kingdom of God by force and violence, and fell back on its truer work of building up a kingdom of righteousness in the hearts and consciences of men. It was from the moment of its seeming fall that its real victory began. As soon as the wild orgy of the Restoration was over, men began to see that nothing that was really worthy in the work of Puritanism had been undone. The revels of Whitehall, the scepticism and debauchery of courtiers, the corruption of statesmen, left the mass of Englishmen what Puritanism had made them, serious, earnest, sober in life and conduct, firm in their love of Protestantism and of freedom. In the Revolution of 1688 Puritanism did the work of civil liberty which it had failed to do in that of 1642. It wrought out through Wesley and the revival of the eighteenth century the work of religious reform which its earlier efforts had only thrown back for a hundred years. Slowly but steadily it introduced its own seriousness and purity into English society, English literature, English politics. The whole history of English progress since the Restoration, on its moral and spiritual sides, has been the history of Puritanism.

CHAPTER IX

THE REVOLUTION

SECTION I.—ENGLAND AND THE REVOLUTION

[*Authorities.*—For social conditions, see the diaries of Pepys and Evelyn, and the Restoration Dramatists, with Macaulay's essay. For Bacon, see Spedding, "Life and Letters of Lord Bacon," and the edition of his works. For Hobbes, see his "Leviathan," and Leslie Stephen, "History of Eighteenth-Century Thought." For the Royal Society, prat, "History of the Royal Society."]

No event ever marked a deeper or a more lasting change in the Modern
emper of the English people than the entry of Charles the Second England
into Whitehall. With it modern England begins. Influences which
had up to this time moulded our history, the theological influence
of the Reformation, the monarchical influence of the new kingship,
the feudal influence of the Middle Ages, the yet earlier influence of
tradition and custom, suddenly lost power over the minds of men.
We find ourselves all at once among the great currents of thought
and activity which have gone on widening and deepening from
that time to this. The England around us is our own England, an
England whose chief forces are industry and science, the love of
popular freedom and of law, an England which presses steadily
forward to a larger social justice and equality, and which tends
more and more to bring every custom and tradition, religious,
intellectual, and political, to the test of pure reason. Between
modern thought, on some at least of its more important sides, and
the thought of men before the Restoration there is a great gulf
fixed. A political thinker in the present day would find it equally
hard to discuss any point of statesmanship with Lord Burleigh or
with Oliver Cromwell. He would find no point of contact between
their ideas of national life or national welfare, their conception of
government or the ends of government, their mode of regarding
economical and social questions, and his own. But no gulf of this
sort parts us from the men who followed the Restoration. From
that time to this, whatever differences there may have been as to
practical conclusions drawn from them, there has been a sub-
stantial agreement as to the grounds of our political, our social,
our intellectual and religious life. Paley would have found no
difficulty in understanding Tillotson: Newton and Sir Humphry
Bovay could have talked without a sense of severance. There would
have been nothing to hinder a perfectly clear discussion on govern-
ment or law between John Locke and Jeremy Bentham.

The change from the old England to the new is so startling that

The
Puritan
Ideal

we are apt to look on it as a more sudden change than it really was, and the outer aspect of the Restoration does much to strengthen this impression of suddenness. The aim of the Puritan had been to set up a visible Kingdom of God upon earth. He had wrought out his aim by reversing the policy of the Stuarts and the Tudors. From the time of Henry the Eighth to the time of Charles the First, the Church had been looked upon primarily as an instrument for securing, by moral and religious influences, the social and political ends of the State. Under the Commonwealth, the State, in its turn, was regarded primarily as an instrument for securing through its political and social influences the moral and religious ends of the Church. In the Puritan theory, Englishmen were "the Lord's people;" a people dedicated to Him by a solemn Covenant, and whose end as a nation was to carry out His will. For such an end it was needful that rulers, as well as people, should be "godly men." Godliness became necessarily the chief qualification for public employment. The new modelling of the army filled its ranks with "saints." Parliament resolved to employ no man "but such as the House shall be satisfied of his real godliness." The Covenant which bound the nation to God bound it to enforce God's laws even more earnestly than its own. The Bible lay on the table of the House of Commons; and its prohibition of swearing, of drunkenness, of fornication became part of the law of the land. Adultery was made felony without the benefit of clergy. Pictures whose subjects jarred with the new decorum were ordered to be burnt, and statues were chipped ruthlessly into decency. It was in the same temper that Puritanism turned from public life to private. The Covenant bound not the whole nation only, but every individual member of the nation, to "a jealous God," a God jealous of any superstition that robbed him of the worship which was exclusively his due, jealous of the distraction and frivolity which robbed him of the entire devotion of man to his service. The want of poetry, of fancy, in the common Puritan temper condemned half the popular observances of England as superstitions. It was superstitious to keep Christmas, or to deck the house with holly and ivy. It was superstitious to dance round the village maypole. It was flat Popery to eat a mince-pie. The rough sport, the mirth and fun of "merry England," were out of place in an England called with so great a calling. Bull-baiting, bear-baiting, horse-racing, cock-fighting, the village revel, the dance on the village green, were put down with the same indiscriminating severity. The long struggle between the Puritans and the play-wrights ended in the closing of every theatre.

The
Revolt
of the
Restora-
tion

The Restoration brought Charles to Whitehall: and in an instant the whole face of England was changed. All that was noblest and best in Puritanism was whirled away with its pettiness and its tyranny in the current of the nation's hate. Religion had been turned into a political and a social tyranny, and it fell with their fall. Godliness became a by-word of scorn; sobriety in dress, in

peech, in manners was flouted as a mark of the detested Puritanism. Butler, in his "Hudibras," poured insult on the past with pedantic buffoonery for which the general hatred, far more than a humour, secured a hearing. Archbishop Sheldon listened to his mock sermon of a Cavalier who held up the Puritan phrase and the Puritan twang to ridicule in his hall at Lambeth. Duelling and raking became the marks of a fine gentleman; and grave divines winked at the follies of "honest fellows," who fought, gambled, wore, drank, and ended a day of debauchery by a night in the gutter. The life of a man of fashion vibrated between frivolity and excess. One of the comedies of the time tells the courtier that he must dress well, dance well, fence well, have a talent for love letters, an agreeable voice, be amorous and discreet—but not too constant." But to graces such as these the rakes of the Restoration added a shamelessness and a brutality which passes belief. Lord Rochester was a fashionable poet, and the titles of some of his poems are such as no pen of our day could copy. Sir Charles Sedley was a fashionable wit, and the foulness of his words made even the porters of Covent Garden pelt him from the balcony when he ventured to address them. The truest type of the time is the Duke of Buckingham, and the most characteristic event in the Duke's life was a duel in which he consummated his seduction of Lady Shrewsbury by killing her husband, while the Countess in disguise as a page held his horse for him and looked on at the murder. Vicious as the stage was, it only reflected the general vice of the time. The Comedy of the Restoration borrowed everything from the Comedy of France save the poetry, the delicacy, and good taste which veiled its grossness. Seduction, intrigue, brutality, cynicism, debauchery, found fitting expression in dialogue of a studied and deliberate foulness, which even its wit fails to redeem from disgust. Wycherley, the first dramatist of the time, remains the most brutal among all writers for the stage; and nothing gives so damning an impression of his day as the fact that he found actors to repeat his words and audiences to applaud them. In men such as Wycherley Milton found types for the Belial of his great poem, than whom a spirit more lewd fell not from Heaven, or more gross to love vice for itself." He piques himself on the frankness and "plain dealing" which painted the world as he saw it, a world of brawls and assignations, of orgies at Vauxhall, and fights with the watch, of lies and double-entendres, of knaves and dupes, of men who sold their daughters, and women who cheated their husbands. But the cynicism of Wycherley was no greater than that of the men about him; and in mere love of what was vile, in contempt of virtue and disbelief in purity or honesty, the King himself stood ahead of any of his subjects.

It is easy however to exaggerate the extent of this reaction. So far as we can judge from the memoirs of the time, its more violent forms were practically confined to the capital and the Court. The mass of Englishmen were satisfied with getting back their may-

The
Earlier
Change

poles and mince-pies; and a large part of the people remained Puritan in life and belief, though they threw aside many of the outer characteristics of Puritanism. Nor was the revolution in feeling as sudden as it seemed. Even if the political strength of Puritanism had remained unbroken, its social influence must soon have ceased. The young Englishmen who grew up in the midst of civil war knew nothing of the bitter tyranny which gave its zeal and fire to the religion of their fathers. From the social and religious anarchy around them, from the endless controversies and discussions of the time, they drank in the spirit of scepticism, of doubt, of free inquiry. If religious enthusiasm had broken the spell of ecclesiastical tradition, its own extravagance broke the spell of religious enthusiasm; and the new generation turned in disgust to try forms of political government and spiritual belief by the cooler and less fallible test of reason. It is easy to see the rapid spread of such a tendency even in the families of the leading Puritans. Neither of Cromwell's sons made any pretensions to religion. Cromwell himself in his later years felt bitterly that Puritanism had missed its aim. He saw the country gentleman, alienated from it by the despotism it had brought in its train, alienated perhaps even more by the appearance of a religious freedom for which he was unprepared, drifting into a love of the older Church that he had once opposed. He saw the growth of a dogged resistance in the people at large. The attempt to secure spiritual results by material force had failed, as it always fails. It broke down before the indifference and resentment of the great mass of the people, of men who were neither lawless nor enthusiasts, but who clung to the older traditions of social order, and whose humour and good sense revolted alike from the artificial conception of human life which Puritanism had formed and from its effort to force such a conception on a people by law. It broke down, too, before the corruption of the Puritans themselves. It was impossible to distinguish between the saint and the hypocrite as soon as godliness became profitable. Ashley Cooper, a sceptic in religion and a profligate in morals, was among "the loudest bagpipes of the squeaking train." Even amongst the really earnest Puritans prosperity disclosed a pride, a worldliness, a selfish hardness which had been hidden in the hour of persecution. The tone of Cromwell's later speeches shows his consciousness that the ground was slipping from under his feet. He no longer dwells on the dream of a Puritan England, of a nation rising as a whole into a People of God. He falls back on the phrases of his youth, and the saints become again a "peculiar people," a remnant, a fragment among the nation at large. But the influences which were really foiling Cromwell's aim, and forming beneath his eyes the new England from which he turned in despair, were influences whose power he can hardly have recognized. Even before the outburst of the Civil War a small group of theological Latitudinarians had gathered round Lord Falkland at Great Tew. In the very year when the King's standard

was set up at Nottingham, Hobbes published the first of his works on Government. The last Royalist had only just laid down his arms when the little company who were at a later time to be known as the Royal Society gathered round Wilkins at Oxford. It is in this group of scientific observers that we catch the secret of the coming generation. From the spiritual problems with which it had so long wrestled in vain, England turned at last to the physical world around it, to the observation of its phenomena, to the discovery of the laws which govern them. The pursuit of Physical Science became a passion; and its method of research, by observation, comparison, and experiment, transformed the older methods of inquiry in matters without its pale. In religion, in politics, in the study of man and of nature, not faith but reason, not tradition but inquiry, were to be the watchwords of the coming time. The dead-weight of the past was suddenly rolled away, and the new England heard at last and understood the call of Francis Bacon.

If in our notice of the Elizabethan literature we omitted all mention of Lord Bacon, it is because the scientific influence of Bacon told not on the age of Elizabeth but on the age of the Restoration. "For my name and memory," he said at the close of his life, "I leave it to men's charitable speeches, and to foreign nations, and the next age." It was to the "next age" too that, in spite of the general sense of his wisdom and ability, the scientific method of Bacon really made its first appeal. What belonged to his own time was the poorest and meanest part of him. Francis Bacon was born at the opening of Elizabeth's reign, three years before the birth of Shakspeare. He was the younger son of a Lord Keeper, as well as the nephew of Lord Burleigh, and even in boyhood his quickness and sagacity won the favour of the Queen. Elizabeth "delighted much to confer with him, and to prove him with questions: unto which he delivered himself with that gravity and maturity above his years that her Majesty would often term him 'the young Lord Keeper.'" His earlier hopes of Court success, however, were soon dashed to the ground. He was left poor by his father's death; the ill-will of the Cecils barred his advancement with the Queen: and a few years before Shakspeare's arrival in London he entered at Gray's Inn, and soon became one of the most successful lawyers of the time. At twenty-three he was a member of the House of Commons, and his judgment and eloquence at once brought him to the front. "The fear of every man that heard him was lest he should make an end," Ben Jonson tells us. The steady growth of his reputation was quickened by the appearance of his "Essays," a work remarkable, not merely for the concentration of its thought and its felicity and exactness of expression, but for the power with which it applied to human life that experimental analysis which Bacon was at a later time to make the key of Science. His fame at once became great at home and abroad, but with this nobler fame Bacon could not content himself. He was conscious of great powers, as well as great aims for the public

Lord
Bacon

1561

1597

good; and it was a time when such aims could hardly be realized save through the means of the Crown. But political employment seemed farther off than ever. At the outset of his career in Parliament he had irritated Elizabeth by a free opposition to her demand of a subsidy; and though the offence was atoned for by profuse apologies, and by the cessation of all further resistance to the policy of the Court, the law offices of the Crown were more than once refused to him, and it was only after the publication of his "Essays" that he could obtain some slight promotion as a Queen's Counsel. The moral weakness which at once disclosed itself is perhaps the best justification of the Queen in her reluctance—a reluctance so strangely in contrast with her ordinary course—to bring the wisest head in her realm to her Council-board. The men whom Elizabeth employed were for the most part men whose intellect was directed by a strong sense of public duty. Their reverence for the Queen, strangely exaggerated as it may seem to us, was guided and controlled by an ardent patriotism and an earnest sense of religion; and with all their regard for the Royal prerogative, they never lost their regard for the law. The grandeur and originality of Bacon's intellect parted him from men like these quite as much as the bluntness of his moral perceptions. In politics, as in science, he had little reverence for the past. Law, constitutional privileges, or religion, were to him simply means of bringing about certain ends of good government; and if these ends could be brought about in shorter fashion he saw only pedantry in insisting on more cumbrous means. He had great social and political ideas to realize, the reform and codification of the law, the civilization of Ireland, the purification of the Church, the union—at a later time—of Scotland and England, educational projects, projects of material improvement, and the like; and the direct and shortest way of realizing these ends was in Bacon's eyes the use of the power of the Crown. But whatever charm such a conception of the Royal power might have for her successor, it seems to have had little charm for Elizabeth; nor was her nature likely to be won by the servility with which Bacon strove to improve his new opportunity of advancement. Partly, perhaps, from rivalry with the Cecils, but certainly in great part from his appreciation of Bacon's power, Lord Essex had steadily backed his efforts after promotion; and his disappointment in them had been alleviated by the Earl's generous present of an estate worth (in our money) some twelve thousand pounds. Bacon showed a true friendship for Essex by dissuading him from the career of opposition which at last brought him to the block; but every tie of friendship and gratitude was forgotten when he appeared as Queen's Counsel to support the charge of treason at the Earl's trial. He aggravated and pressed home the charge with his whole energy and skill; and accepted a large gift from the court for his later service in publishing a garbled account of the "practices and treasons" of his friend. But Elizabeth still remained cold to his advances; and it was not till

the accession of James that the rays of Royal favour broke slowly upon him. He became successively Solicitor and Attorney-General; the year of Shakspeare's death saw him called to the Privy Council; he verified Elizabeth's prediction by becoming Lord Keeper. At last the goal of his ambition was reached. He had attached himself to the rising fortunes of Buckingham, and the favour of Buckingham made him Lord Chancellor. He was raised to the peerage as Baron Verulam, and created, at a later time, Viscount St. Albans. But the nobler dreams for which these meaner honours had been sought escaped his grasp. His projects still remained projects, while Bacon to retain his hold on office was stooping to a miserable compliance with the worst excesses of Buckingham and his Royal master. The years during which he held the Chancellorship were the most disgraceful years of a disgraceful reign. They saw the execution of Raleigh, the sacrifice of the Palatinate, the exaction of benevolences, the multiplication of monopolies, the supremacy of Buckingham. Against none of the acts of folly and wickedness which distinguished James's government did Bacon do more than protest; in some of the worst, and above all in the attempt to coerce the judges into rostrating law at the King's feet, he took a personal part. But even his remonstrances were too much for the young favourite, who regarded him as the mere creature of his will. It was in vain that Bacon flung himself at the Duke's feet, and begged him to pardon a single instance of opposition to his caprice. A Parliament as impending, and Buckingham resolved to avert from himself the storm which was gathering by sacrificing to it his meaner dependants. To ordinary eyes the Chancellor was at the summit of human success. Jonson had just sung of him as one "whose even thread the Fates spin round and full out of their choicest and their whitest wool," when the storm burst. The great Parliament of 1620 met after a silence of six disgraceful years, and one of its first acts was to charge Bacon with corruption in the exercise of his office. He at once pleaded guilty to the charge. "I do plainly and ingenuously confess that I am guilty of corruption, and do renounce all defence." "I beseech your Lordships," he added, "to be merciful to a broken reed." The heavy fine imposed on him was remitted by the Crown; but the Great Seal was taken from him, and he was declared incapable of holding office in the state or of sitting in Parliament.

Bacon's fall restored him to that position of real greatness from which his ambition had so long torn him away. "My conceit of his person," said Ben Jonson, "was never increased towards him by his place or honours. But I have and do reverence him for his readiness that was only proper to himself, in that he seemed to me ever by his work one of the greatest men, and most worthy of admiration, that had been in many ages. In his adversity I ever prayed that God would give him strength: for greatness he could not want." His intellectual activity was never more conspicuous than in the last four years of his life. He began a digest of the laws,

- and a "History of England under the Tudors," revised and expanded his "Essays," dictated a jest book, and busied himself with experiments in physics. It was while studying the effect of cold in preventing animal putrefaction that he stopped his coach to stuff a fowl with snow and caught the fever which ended in his death. The great work of his life remained a fragment to the last.
- 1628 Even as a boy at College he had expressed his dislike of the Aristotelean philosophy, as "a philosophy only strong for disputations and contentions, but barren of the production of works for the benefit of the life of man." As a law-student of twenty-one he sketched in a tract on the "Greatest Birth of Time" the system of inductive inquiry he was already prepared to substitute for it.
- 1605 At forty-four, after the final disappointment of his political hopes from Elizabeth, the publication of the "Advancement of Learning" marked the first decisive appearance of the new philosophy. The close of this work was, in his own words, "a general and faithful perambulation of learning, with an inquiry what parts thereof lie fresh and waste, and not improved and converted by the industry of man; to the end that such a plot, made and recorded to memory, may both minister light to any public designation and also serve to excite voluntary endeavours." It was only by such a survey, he held, that men could be turned from useless studies, or ineffectual means of pursuing more useful ones, and directed to the true end of knowledge as "a rich storehouse for the glory of the Creator and the relief of man's estate." Two years later appeared his "Cogitata et Visa," a first sketch of the "Novum Organum," which in its complete form was presented to James immediately before Bacon's fall. The year after his fall he produced his "Natural and Experimental History." This, with the "Novum Organum" and the "Advancement of Learning," was all of his projected "Instauratio Magna" which he was destined to complete—and even of this portion we have only part of the last two divisions. The "Ladder of the Understanding," which was to have followed these and led up from experience to science, the "Anticipations," or provisional hypotheses for the inquiries of the new philosophy, and the closing account of "Science in Practice" were left for posterity to bring to completion. "We may, as we trust," said Bacon, "make no despicable beginnings. The destinies of the human race must complete it, in such a manner perhaps as men looking only at the present world would not readily conceive. For upon this will depend, not only a speculative good, but all the fortunes of mankind, and all their power." When we turn from words like these to the actual work which Bacon did, it is hard not to feel a certain disappointment. He did not thoroughly understand the older philosophy which he attacked. His revolt from the waste of human intelligence which he conceived to be owing to the adoption of a false method of investigation blinded him to the real value of deduction as an instrument of discovery; and he was encouraged in his contempt for it as much
- 1620

his own ignorance of mathematics as by the non-existence in day of the great deductive sciences of physics and astronomy. He had he a more accurate prevision of the method of modern science. The inductive process to which he exclusively directed his attention bore no fruit in Bacon's hands. The "art of investigating nature" on which he prided himself has proved less for scientific purposes, and would be rejected by modern investigators. Where he was on a more correct track he can hardly be regarded as original. "It may be doubted," says Dugald Stewart, "whether any one important rule with regard to the method of investigation be contained in his works of which no trace can be traced in those of his predecessors." Not only indeed

Bacon fail to anticipate the methods of modern science, but even rejected the great scientific discoveries of his own day. He set aside with the same scorn the astronomical theory of Copernicus and the magnetic investigations of Gilbert, and the attempt seems to have been fully returned. "The Lord Chancellor wrote on science," said Harvey, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, "like a Lord Chancellor."

In spite however of his inadequate appreciation either of the old philosophy or the new, the almost unanimous voice of later ages is attributed, and justly attributed, to the "Novum Organum" decisive influence on the development of modern science. If he is credited in revealing the method of experimental research, Bacon is the first to proclaim the existence of a Philosophy of Science, to insist on the unity of knowledge and inquiry throughout the physical world, to give dignity by the large and noble temper in which he treated them to the petty details of experiment in which science had to begin, to clear a way for it by setting scornfully aside the traditions of the past, to claim for it its true rank and due, and to point to the enormous results which its culture would bring in increasing the power and happiness of mankind. In one respect his attitude was in the highest degree significant. The age which he lived was one in which theology was absorbing the intellectual energy of the world. He was the servant, too, of a king in whom theological studies superseded all others. But if he lived in all else to James, Bacon would not, like Casaubon, bow his head. He would not even, like Descartes, attempt to transform philosophy by turning reason into a mode of theological demonstration. He stood absolutely aloof from it. Though as a politician he did not shrink from dealing with such subjects as Church Reform, he dealt with them simply as matters of civil polity. But from his exhaustive enumeration of the branches of human knowledge he excluded theology, and theology alone. His method was of itself inapplicable to a subject, where the premisses were assumed to be certain, and the results known. His aim was to seek for unknown results by simple experiment. It was against received authority and accepted tradition in matters of inquiry that his whole system was tested; what he urged was the need of making belief rest

strictly on proof, and proof rest on the conclusions drawn from evidence by reason. But in theology—all theologians asserted—reason played but a subordinate part. “If I proceed to treat of it,” said Bacon, “I shall step out of the bark of human reason, and enter into the ship of the Church. Neither will the stars of philosophy, which have hitherto so nobly shone on us, any longer give us their light.” The certainty indeed of conclusions on such subjects was out of harmony with the grandest feature of Bacon’s work, his noble confession of the liability of every inquirer to error. It was his especial task to warn men against the “vain shows” of knowledge which had so long hindered any real advance in it, the “idols” of the Tribe, the Den, the Forum, and the Theatre, the errors which spring from the systematizing spirit which pervades all masses of men, or from individual idiosyncracies, or from the strange power of words and phrases over the mind, or from the traditions of the past. Nor were the claims of theology easily to be reconciled with the position which he was resolute to assign to natural science. “Through all those ages,” Bacon says, “wherein men of genius or learning principally or ever moderately flourished, the smallest part of human industry has been spent on natural philosophy, though this ought to be esteemed as the great mother of the sciences: for all the rest, if torn from this root, may perhaps be polished and formed for use, but can receive little increase.” It was by the adoption of the method of inductive inquiry which physical science was to make its own, and by basing inquiry on the ground which physical science could supply, that the moral sciences, ethics and politics, could alone make any real advance. “Let none expect any great promotion of the sciences, especially in their effective part, unless natural philosophy be drawn out to particular sciences; and, again, unless these particular sciences be brought back again to natural philosophy. From this defect it is that astronomy, optics, music, many mechanical arts, and (what seems stranger) even moral and civil philosophy and logic rise but little above the foundations, and only skim over the varieties and surfaces of things.”

It was this lofty conception of the position and destiny of natural science which Bacon was the first to impress upon mankind at large. The age was one in which knowledge, as we have seen, was passing to fields of inquiry which had till then been unknown, in which Kepler and Galileo were creating modern astronomy, in which Descartes was revealing the laws of motion, and Harvey the circulation of the blood. But to the mass of men this great change was all but imperceptible; and it was the energy, the profound conviction, the eloquence of Bacon which first called the attention of mankind as a whole to the power and importance of physical research. It was he who by his lofty faith in the results and victories of the new philosophy nerved its followers to a zeal and confidence equal to his own. It was he who above all gave dignity to the slow and patient processes of investigation, of experiment, of com-

on, to the sacrificing of hypothesis to fact, to the single aim truth, which was to be the law of modern science. But, in and at least, Bacon stood—as we have said—before his age. Beginnings of physical science were more slow and timid there in any country of Europe. Only two discoveries of any real came from English research before the Restoration; the Gilbert's discovery of terrestrial magnetism in the close of Elizabeth's reign; the next, the great discovery of the circulation of blood, which was taught by Harvey in the reign of James. Apart from these illustrious names England took little share in the scientific movement of the continent; and her whole energies had to be whirled into the vortex of theology and politics by civil War. But the war had not reached its end when a little number of students were to be seen in London, men "inquisitive," one of them, "into natural philosophy and other parts of natural learning, and particularly of what hath been called the Philosophy . . . which from the times of Galileo at Florence, Sir Francis Bacon (Lord Verulam) in England, hath been cultivated in Italy, France, Germany, and other parts abroad, as well as with us in England." The strife of the time had aided in directing the minds of men to natural inquiries. "We have been always tossing about some theological question," the first historian of the Royal Society, Bishop Sprat, "would have been to have made that their private diversion, the excess of it they disliked in the public. To have been eternally musing on civil business and the distresses of the country was too melancholy a reflection. It was nature alone which could pleasantly detain them in that estate." Foremost in the group stood Francis Wallis and Wilkins, whose removal to Oxford, which had been reorganized by the Puritan Visitors, divided the little number into two societies. The Oxford society, which was the more important of the two, held its meetings at the lodgings of Francis Wilkins, who had become Warden of Wadham College, and added to the names of its members that of the eminent mathematician Dr. Ward, and that of the first of English economists, William Petty. "Our business," Wallis tells us, "was (preparing matters of theology and State affairs) to discourse and order of philosophical inquiries and such as related thereunto, physics, Anatomy, Geometry, Astronomy, Navigation, Statics, Optics, Chymicks, Mechanicks, and Natural Experiments: the state of these studies, as then cultivated at home and abroad. We then discoursed of the circulation of the blood, the veins in the *venæ lacteæ*, the lymphatic vessels, the Copernican thesis, the nature of comets and new stars, the satellites of Jupiter, the oval shape of Saturn, the spots in the sun and its turn on its own axis, the inequalities and selenography of the moon, several phases of Venus and Mercury, the improvement of the telescope, the grinding of glasses for that purpose, the weight of air, the possibility or impossibility of vacuities, and nature's

1645

1648

abhorrence thereof, the Torricellian experiment in quicksilver, the descent of heavy bodies and the degree of acceleration therein, and divers other things of like nature."

The
Royal
Society

The other little company of inquirers, who remained in London, was at last broken up by the troubles of the Second Protectorate; but it was revived at the Restoration by the return to London of the more eminent members of the Oxford group. Science suddenly became the fashion of the day. Charles was himself a fair chemist, and took a keen interest in the problems of navigation. The Duke of Buckingham varied his freaks of rhyming, drinking, and fiddling, by fits of devotion to his laboratory. Poets like Denham and Cowley, courtiers like Sir Robert Murray and Sir Kenelm Digby, joined the scientific company to which in token of his sympathy with it the King gave the title of "The Royal Society." The curious glass toys called Prince Rupert's drops recall the scientific inquiries which amused the old age of the great cavalry-leader of the Civil War. Wits and fops crowded to the meetings of the new Society. Statesmen like Lord Somers felt honoured at being chosen its presidents. Its definite establishment marks the opening of a great age of scientific discovery in England. Almost every year of the half-century which followed saw some step made to a wider and truer knowledge. Our first national observatory rose at Greenwich, and modern astronomy began with the long series of astronomical observations which immortalized the name of Flamsteed. His successor, Halley, undertook the investigation of the tides, of comets, and of terrestrial magnetism. Hooke improved the microscope, and gave a fresh impulse to microscopical research. Boyle made the air-pump a means of advancing the science of pneumatics, and became the founder of experimental chemistry. Wilkins pointed forward to the science of philology in his scheme of a universal language. Sydenham introduced a careful observation of nature and facts which changed the whole face of medicine. The physiological researches of Willis first threw light upon the structure of the brain. Woodward was the founder of mineralogy. In his edition of Willoughby's "Ornithology," and in his own "History of Fishes," John Ray was the first to raise zoology to the rank of a science; and the first scientific classification of animals was attempted in his "Synopsis of Quadrupeds." Modern botany began with his "History of Plants," and the researches of an Oxford professor, Robert Morrison; while Grow divided with Malpighi the credit of founding the study of vegetable physiology. But great as some of these names undoubtedly are, they are lost in the lustre of Isaac Newton. Newton was born at Woolsthorpe in Lincolnshire, on Christmas-day, in the memorable year which saw the outbreak of the Civil War. In the year of the Restoration he entered Cambridge, where the teaching of Isaac Barrow quickened his genius for mathematics, and where the method of Descartes had superseded the older modes of study. From the close of his Cambridge career his life became a series of great physical dis-

1662

1642

es. At twenty-three he facilitated the calculation of planetary
nents by his theory of Fluxions. The optical discoveries to 1665
he was led by his experiments with the prism, and which
rtly disclosed in the lectures which he delivered as Mathe-
al Professor at Cambridge, were embodied in the theory of
which he laid before the Royal Society on becoming a Fellow 1671
His discovery of the law of gravitation had been made as
as 1666; but the erroneous estimate which was then generally
ed of the earth's diameter prevented him from disclosing it
teen years; and it was not till the eve of the Revolution
he "Principia" revealed to the world his new theory of the 1687
rse.

Impossible to do more than indicate, in such a summary as The
ve given, the wonderful activity of directly scientific thought Latitudi-
distinguished the age of the Restoration. But the sceptical narians
xperimental temper of mind which this activity disclosed
n every phase of the world around it. We see the attempt to
religious speculation into harmony with the conclusions of
and experience in the school of Latitudinarian theologians
prang from the group of thinkers which gathered on the eve
Civil War round Lord Falkland at Great Tew. Whatever
t history may pronounce on Falkland's political career, his
must ever remain memorable in the history of religious
ht. A new era in English religion began with the speculations
men he gathered round him. Their work was above all to
the authority of tradition in matters of faith, as Bacon had
l it in matters of physical research; and to assert in the one
s in the other the supremacy of reason as a test of truth. Of
thority of the Church, its Fathers, and its Councils, John
a Canon of Windsor, and a friend of Laud, said briefly "it is
' He dismissed with contempt the accepted test of uni-
ity. "Universality is such a proof of truth as truth itself is
ied of. The most singular and strongest part of human
ity is properly in the wisest and the most virtuous, and these,
, are not the most universal." William Chillingworth, a man
ger if not keener mind, had been taught by an early con-
n to Catholicism, and by a speedy return, the insecurity of
asis for belief but that of private judgment. In his "Religion
testants" he set aside ecclesiastical tradition or Church
rity as grounds of faith in favour of the Bible, but only of
ible as interpreted by the common reason of men. Jeremy
r, the most brilliant of English preachers, a sufferer like
gworth on the Royalist side during the troubles, and who
warded at the Restoration with the bishopric of Down,
d even the authority of the Scriptures themselves. Reason
e one means which Taylor approved of in interpreting the
but the certainty of the conclusions which reason drew
the Bible varied, as he held, with the conditions of reason
In all but the simplest truths of natural religion "we are

not sure not to be deceived." The deduction of points of belief from the words of the Scriptures was attended with all the uncertainty and liability to error which sprang from the infinite variety of human understandings, the difficulties which hinder the discovery of truth, and the influences which divert the mind from accepting or rightly estimating it. It was plain to a mind like Chillingworth's that this denial of authority, this perception of the imperfection of reason in the discovery of absolute truth, struck as directly at the root of Protestant dogmatism, as at the root of Catholic infallibility. "If Protestants are faulty in this matter [of claiming authority] it is for doing it too much and not too little. This presumptuous imposing of the senses of man upon the words of God, of the special senses of man upon the general words of God, and laying them upon men's consciences together under the equal penalty of death and damnation, this vain conceit that we can speak of the things of God better than in the words of God, this deifying our own interpretations and tyrannous enforcing them upon others, this restraining of the word of God from that latitude and generality, and the understandings of men from that liberty wherein Christ and His apostles left them, is and hath been the only foundation of all the schisms of the Church, and that which makes them immortal." In his "Liberty of Prophecy" Jeremy Taylor pleaded the cause of toleration with a weight of argument which hardly required the triumph of the Independents and the shock of Naseby to drive it home. But the freedom of conscience which the Independent founded on the personal communion of each soul with God, the Latitudinarian founded on the weakness of authority and the imperfection of human reason. Taylor pleads even for the Anabaptist and the Romanist. He only gives place to the action of the civil magistrate in "those religions whose principles destroy government," and "those religions—if there be any such—which teach ill life." Hales openly professed that he would quit the Church to-morrow if it required him to believe that all that dissented from it must be damned. Chillingworth denounced persecution in words of fire. "Take away this persecution, burning, cursing, damning of men for not subscribing the words of men as the words of God; require of Christians only to believe Christ and to call no man master but Him; let them leave claiming infallibility that have no title to it, and let them that in their own words disclaim it, disclaim it also in their actions. . . . Protestants are inexcusable if they do offer violence to other men's consciences." From the denunciation of intolerance the Latitudinarians passed easily to the dream of comprehension which had haunted every nobler soul since the "Utopia" of More. Hales based his loyalty to the Church of England on the fact that it was the largest and the most tolerant Church in Christendom. Chillingworth pointed out how many obstacles to comprehension were removed by such a simplification of belief as flowed from a rational theology. Like More, he asked for "such an ordering of the public service of God

at all who believe the Scripture and live according to it might not scruple or hypocrisy or protestation in any part join in Taylor, like Chillingworth, rested his hope of union on the efficacy of belief. He saw a probability of error in all the s and confessions adopted by Christian Churches. "Such s of confessions and articles," he said, "must do much hurt." is rather the schismatic who makes unnecessary and incon- nent impositions, than he who disobeys them because he cannot herwise without violating his conscience." The Apostles' in its literal meaning seemed to him the one term of Christian which the Church had any right to impose.

th the Restoration the Latitudinarians came at once to the

They were soon distinguished from both Puritans and High shmen by their opposition to dogma, by their preference of a to tradition whether of the Bible or the Church, by their g religion on a natural theology, by their aiming at rightness rather than at correctness of opinion, by their advocacy of ation and comprehension as the grounds of Christian unity. ngworth and Taylor found successors in the restless good of Burnet, the enlightened piety of Tillotson, and the calm ophy of Bishop Butler. Meanwhile the impulse which such were giving to religious speculation was being given to al and social inquiry by a mind of far greater keenness and

son's favourite secretary was Thomas Hobbes. "He was Hobbes ed by his Lordship," Aubrey tells us, "who was wont to have alk in his delicate groves, where he did meditate; and when ion darted into his mind, Mr. Hobbes was presently to write vn. And his Lordship was wont to say that he did it better anyone else about him; for that many times when he read notes he scarce understood what they writ, because they stood it not clearly themselves." The long life of Hobbes as a memorable space in our history. He was born in the year victory over the Armada; he died, at the age of ninety-two, nine years before the Revolution. His ability soon made itself nd in his earlier days he was the secretary of Bacon, and the of Ben Jonson and Lord Herbert of Cherbury. But it was ll the age of fifty-four, when he withdrew to France on the the Great Rebellion, that his speculations were made known world in his treatise "De Cive." He joined the exiled Court ris, and became mathematical tutor to Charles the Second,

love and regard for him seems to have been real to the But his post was soon forfeited by the appearance of his iathan;" he was forbidden to approach the Court, and ed to England, where he seems to have acquiesced in the f Cromwell. The Restoration brought him a pension; but his eat works were condemned by Parliament, and "Hobbism" ie, ere he died, the popular synonym for irreligion and rality. Prejudice of this kind sounded oddly in the case of a

1588
to
1679

1642

1651

writer who had laid down, as the two things necessary to salvation, Faith in Christ and obedience to the law. But the prejudice sprang from a true sense of the effect which the Hobbist philosophy must necessarily have on the current religion and the current notions of political and social morality. Hobbes was the first great English writer who dealt with the science of government from the ground, not of tradition, but of reason. It was in his treatment of man in the stage of human development which he supposed to precede that of society that he came most roughly into conflict with the accepted beliefs. Men, in his theory, were by nature equal, and their only natural relation was a state of war. It was no innate virtue of man himself which created human society out of this chaos of warring strengths. Hobbes in fact denied the existence of the more spiritual sides of man's nature. His hard and narrow logic dissected every human custom and desire, and reduced even the most sacred to demonstrations of a prudent selfishness. Friendship was simply a sense of social utility to one another. The so-called laws of nature, such as gratitude or the love of our neighbour, were in fact contrary to the natural passions of man, and powerless to restrain them. Nor had religion rescued man by the interposition of a Divine will. Nothing better illustrates the daring with which the new scepticism was to break through the theological traditions of the older world than the pitiless logic with which Hobbes assailed the very theory of revelation. "To say God hath spoken to man in a dream, is no more than to say man dreamed that God hath spoken to him." "To say one hath seen a vision, or heard a voice, is to say he hath dreamed between sleeping and waking." Religion, in fact, was nothing more than "the fear of invisible powers;" and here, as in all other branches of human science, knowledge dealt with words and not with things. It was man himself who for his own profit created society, by laying down certain of his natural rights and retaining only those of self-preservation. A Covenant between man and man originally created "that great Leviathan called the Commonwealth or State, which is but an artificial man, though of greater stature and strength than the natural, for whose protection and defence it was intended." The fiction of such an "original contract" has long been dismissed from political speculation, but its effect at the time of its first appearance was immense. Its almost universal acceptance put an end to the religious and patriarchal theories of society, on which Kingship had till now founded its claim of a Divine right to authority which no subject might question. But if Hobbes destroyed the old ground of Royal despotism, he laid a new and a firmer one. To create a society at all, he held that the whole body of the governed must have resigned all rights save that of self-preservation into the hands of a single ruler, who was the representative of all. Such a ruler was absolute, for to make terms with him implied a man making terms with himself. The transfer of rights was inalienable, and after generations were as much bound by it as

generation which made the transfer. As the head of the whole, the ruler judged every question, settled the laws of civil or injustice, or decided between religion and superstition. was a Divine Right, and the only Divine Right, because in were absorbed all the rights of each of his subjects. It was not y constitutional check that Hobbes looked for the prevention ranny, but in the common education and enlightenment as eir real end and the best mode of reaching it on the part of subjects and Prince. And the real end of both was the weal e Commonwealth at large. It was in laying boldly down this of government, as well as in the basis of contract on which ho e government repose, that Hobbes really influenced all later ics. Locke, like his master, derived political authority from onsent of the governed, and adopted the common weal as its

But in the theory of Locke the people remain passively ssion of the power which they have delegated to the Prince, have the right to withdraw it if it be used for purposes incon- at with the end which society was formed to promote. To the n of all power in the people, and the end of all power for the le's good—the two great doctrines of Hobbes—Locke added ight of resistance, the responsibility of princes to their subjects due execution of their trust, and the supremacy of legislative nblies as the voice of the people itself. It was in this modified enlarged form that the new political philosophy revealed itself e Revolution of 1688.

SECTION II.—THE RESTORATION, 1660—1667

authorities.—For Clarendon's ministry, see his *Life*. For the period neral, see Burnet, "*History of his Own Time*," with Foxcroft's e ment; Clarke, "*Life of James II.*"; Macpherson, "*Original s*"; the diaries of Pepys and Evelyn; Temple's *Works*; and orks of Andrew Marvel. The "*Parliamentary History*" and the dar of *State Papers, Domestic* (to 1676) must be added. Among rn historians, Ranke, "*History of England*," is the most important; so Hallam, "*Constitutional History*"; Osmund Airy, "*Charles and Macaulay's* "*Essays*." For the Nonconformists, see Baxter's obigraphy"; Bunyan's works; and Hutton's volume in Hunt tephens, "*History of the English Church*." For documents, see tson, "*Select Statutes, Cases, and Documents*."]

is only by a survey of the larger tendencies of English thought we can understand the course of English history in the years followed the Restoration. When Charles the Second entered ehall, the work of the Long Parliament seemed undone. Not was the Monarchy restored, but it was restored without ction or condition; and of the two great influences which had rto served as checks on its power, the first, that of Puritanism, become hateful to the nation at large, while the second, the sion of constitutional liberty, was discredited by the issue of

The
Restora-
tion

the Civil War. But amidst all the tumult of demonstrative loyalty the great "revolution of the seventeenth century," as it has justly been styled, went steadily on. The supreme power was gradually transferred from the Crown to the House of Commons. Step by step, Parliament drew nearer to a solution of the political problem which had so long foiled its efforts, the problem how to make its will the law of administrative action without itself undertaking the task of administration. It is only by carefully fixing our eyes on this transfer of power, and by noting the successive steps towards its realization, that we can understand the complex history of the Restoration and the Revolution.

The first acts of the new Government showed a sense that, loyal as was the temper of the nation, its loyalty was by no means the blind devotion of the Cavalier. The chief part in the Restoration had in fact been played by the Presbyterians; and the Presbyterians were still powerful from their exclusive possession of the magistracy and all local authority. The first ministry, therefore, which Charles ventured to form, bore on it the marks of a compromise. Its most influential member was Sir Edward Hyde, the adviser of the King during his exile, who now became Earl of Clarendon and Lord Chancellor. Lord Southampton, a steady Royalist, accepted the post of Lord Treasurer; and the devotion of Ormond was rewarded with a dukedom and the dignity of Lord Steward. But the Presbyterian interest was even more powerfully represented. Monk remained Lord-General with the title of Duke of Albemarle. The King's brother, James, Duke of York, was made Lord Admiral; but the administration of the fleet was virtually in the hands of one of Cromwell's followers, Montagu, the new Earl of Sandwich. Lord Saye and Sele was made Lord Privy Seal. Sir Ashley Cooper was soon rewarded for his services by a barony and the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer. Of the two Secretaries of State, the one, Nicholas, was a devoted Royalist; the other, Morice, was a steady Presbyterian. Of the thirty members of the Privy Council, twelve had borne arms against the King. It was clear that such a ministry was hardly likely to lend itself to a mere policy of reaction; and even its most Royalist members, Clarendon and Southampton, were Royalists of a constitutional type.

he
onven-
on

The policy of the new Government, therefore, fell fairly in with the temper of the Convention, which, after declaring itself a Parliament, proceeded to consider the measures which were requisite for a settlement of the nation. The Convention had been chosen under the ordinances which excluded Royalist "Malignants" from the right of voting; and the bulk of its members were men of Presbyterian sympathies, loyalist to the core, but as averse to despotism as the Long Parliament itself. In its earlier days a member who asserted that those who had fought against the King were as guilty as those who cut off his head was sternly rebuked from the Chair. The first measure which was undertaken by the House, the Bill of

1660
to
1667

amity and Oblivion for all offences committed during the troubles, showed at once the moderate character of the Commons. In the punishment of the Regicides indeed, a Presbyterian might well be as zealous as a Cavalier. In spite of a Proclamation he had issued in the first days of his return, in which he was virtually promised to all the judges of the late King who surrendered themselves to justice, Charles pressed for revenge those whom he regarded as his father's murderers, and they went hotly with the King. It is to the credit of the Commons that they steadily resisted the cry for blood. By the original provisions of the Bill of Oblivion and Indemnity only seven of the

Regicides were excluded from pardon; and though the royalist fervour during the three months in which the bill was in discussion forced the House in the end to leave almost all in the course of justice, the requirement of a special Act of Parliament for the execution of those who had surrendered under the Amnesties protected the lives of most of them. Twenty-eight of the King's Judges were in the end arraigned at the bar, but only three were executed, and only one of these, General Harrison, played any conspicuous part in the rebellion. Twenty others, who had been prominent in what were now called "the troubles" of the past twenty years, were declared incapable of holding office in the State: and by an unjustifiable clause which was introduced into the Act before its final adoption, Sir Harry Vane and John Lambert, though they had taken no part in the King's death, were specially exempted from the general pardon. In dealing with the questions of property which arose from the confiscations and transfers of estates during the Civil Wars the Convention met yet greater difficulties. No opposition was made to the reversion of all Crown-lands by the State, but the Convention refused to protect the rights of those who had purchased Church property, and of those who were in actual possession of private estates which had been confiscated by the Long Parliament, and the government which succeeded it. The bills however which were prepared for this purpose were delayed by the artifices of the royalists; and at the close of the session the bishops and the evicted gentry quietly re-entered into the occupation of their old possessions. The Royalists indeed were far from being satisfied with this summary confiscation. Fines and sequestrations had alienated all the steady adherents of the Royal cause, and had driven many of them to forced sales of their estates; and a demand was made for compensation for their losses and the cancelling of the forced sales. Without such provisions, said the frenzied Cavaliers, it would be "a Bill of Indemnity for the King's enemies, and oblivion for his friends." But here the Convention stood firm. Transfers of property by sale were recognized as valid, and all claims of compensation for losses by sequestration were barred by the Act. From the settlement of the nation the Convention passed to the settlement of the relations between the nation and the

1660
to
1667

Crown. So far was the constitutional work of the Long Parliament from being undone, that its more important measures were silently accepted as the base of future government. Not a voice demanded the restoration of the Star Chamber, or of monopolies, or of the Court of High Commission; no one disputed the justice of the condemnation of Ship-money, or the assertion of the sole right of Parliament to grant supplies to the Crown. The Militia, indeed, was placed in the King's hands; but the army was disbanded, though Charles was permitted to keep a few regiments for his guard. The revenue was fixed at £1,200,000; and this sum was granted to the King for life, a grant which might have been perilous for freedom had not the taxes provided to supply the sum fallen constantly below this estimate, while the current expenses of the Crown, even in time of peace, greatly exceeded it. But even for this grant a heavy price was exacted. Though the rights of the Crown over lands held, as the bulk of English estates were held, in military tenure, had ceased to be of any great pecuniary value, they were indirectly a source of considerable power. The right of wardship and of marriage, above all, enabled the sovereign to exercise a galling pressure on every landed proprietor in his social and domestic concerns. Under Elizabeth, the right of wardship had been used to secure the education of all Catholic minors in the Protestant faith; and under James and his successor minors and heiresses had been granted to Court favourites or sold in open market to the highest bidder. But the real value of these rights to the Crown lay in the political pressure which it was able to exert through them on the country gentry. A squire was naturally eager to buy the good will of a sovereign who might soon be the guardian of his daughter and the administrator of his estate. But the same motives which made the Crown cling to this prerogative made the Parliament anxious to do away with it. Its efforts to bring this about under James the First had been foiled by the King's stubborn resistance; but the long interruption of these rights during the wars made their revival almost impossible at the Restoration, and one of the first acts therefore of the Convention was to free the country gentry by abolishing the claims of the Crown to reliefs and wardship, purveyance, and pre-emption, and by the conversion of lands held till then in chivalry into lands held in common socage. In lieu of his rights, Charles accepted a grant of £100,000 a year; a sum which it was originally purposed to raise by a tax on the lands thus exempted from feudal exactions; but which was provided for in the end, with less justice, by a general excise.

The
avallier
arlia-
ment

Successful as the Convention had been in effecting the settlement of political matters, it failed in bringing about a settlement of the Church. In his proclamation from Breda, Charles had promised to respect liberty of conscience, and to assent to any Acts of Parliament which should be presented to him for its security. The Convention was in the main Presbyterian; but it soon became plain that the continuance of a purely Presbyterian system was im-

de. "The generality of the people," wrote a shrewd Scotch
 ver from London, "are doting after Prelacy and the Service-
 " The Convention, however, still hoped for some modified
 of Episcopalian government which would enable the bulk of
 uritan party to remain within the Church. A large part of
 isting clergy, indeed, were Independents, and for these no
 omise with Episcopacy was possible: but the greater number
 noderate Presbyterians, who were ready "for fear of worse"
 omit to such a plan of Church government as Archbishop
 had proposed, a plan in which the bishop was only the
 lent of a diocesan board of presbyters, and to accept the
 gy with a few amendments and the omission of the "super-
 is practices." It was to a compromise of this kind that the
 himself leant at the beginning, and a Royal proclamation
 ed his approval of the Puritan demands; but a bill intro-
 by Sir Matthew Hale to turn this proclamation into law was
 by the opposition of Hyde, and by the promise of a Con-
 e. The ejected Episcopalian clergy who still remained alive
 d again into their livings; the bishops returned to their sees;
 he dissolution of the Convention-Parliament destroyed the
 ope of an ecclesiastical compromise. The tide of loyalty had,
 t, been rising fast during its session, and the influence of this
 en in one of the latest resolutions of the Convention itself.
 odies of Cromwell, Bradshaw, and Ireton were torn by its
 from their graves and hung on gibbets at Tyburn, while
 of Pym and Blake were cast out of Westminster Abbey into
 argaret's churchyard. But in the elections for the new
 ment the zeal for Church and King swept all hope of modera-
 nd compromise before it. The new members were for the
 part young men, and "the most profane, swearing fellows,"
 a Puritan, Samuel Pepys, "that ever I heard in my life."
 resbyterians sank to a handful of fifty members. The loyalty
 Parliament far outran that of Clarendon himself. Though
 firmed the acts of the Convention, it could with difficulty be
 ht to assent to the Act of Indemnity. The Commons pressed
 o prosecution of Vane. Vane was protected alike by the spirit
 law and by the King's pledge to the Convention that, even
 icted of treason, he would not suffer him to be brought to
 ock. But he was now brought to trial on the charge of
 n against a King "kept out of his Royal authority by
 s and rebels," and his spirited defence served as an excuse
 execution. "He is too dangerous a man to let live," Charles
 with characteristic coolness, "if we can safely put him out
 way." But the new members were yet better Churchmen
 oyalists. A common suffering had thrown the gentry and the
 opalian clergy together, and for the first time in our history
 untry squires were zealous for the Church. At the opening of
 ession they ordered every member to receive the communion,
 ie League and Covenant to be solemnly burnt by the common

1660
 to
 1667

1661

1660
to
1667

hangman in Palace Yard. The bishops were restored to their seats in the House of Lords. The conference at the Savoy between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians broke up in anger, and the few alterations made in the Liturgy were made with a view to disgust rather than to conciliate the Puritan party. The strongholds of this party were the corporations of the boroughs; and an attempt was made to drive them from those by a severe Corporation Act, which required a reception of the communion according to the rites of the Anglican Church, a renunciation of the League and Covenant, and a declaration that it was unlawful on any grounds to take up arms against the King, before admission to municipal offices. A more deadly blow was dealt at the Puritans in the renewal of the Act of Uniformity. Not only was the use of the Prayer-book, and the Prayer-book only, enforced in all public worship, but an unfeigned consent and assent was demanded from every minister of the Church to all which was contained in it; while, for the first time since the Reformation, all orders save those conferred by the hands of bishops were legally disallowed. It was in vain that Ashley opposed the bill fiercely in the Lords, and that even Clarendon, who felt that the King's word was at stake, pressed for the insertion of clauses enabling the Crown to grant dispensations from its provisions. Charles, whose aim was to procure a toleration for the Catholics by allowing the Presbyterians to feel the pressure of persecution, assented to the bill while he promised to suspend its execution by the exercise of his prerogative.

St.
Bartho-
lomew's
Day
1662

The bishops however were resolute to enforce the law; and on St. Bartholomew's day, the last day allowed for compliance with its requirements, nearly two thousand rectors and vicars, or about a fifth of the English clergy, were driven from their parishes as Nonconformists. No such sweeping change in the religious aspect of the Church had ever been seen before. The changes of the Reformation had been brought about with little change in the clergy itself. Even the severities of the High Commission under Elizabeth ended in the expulsion of a few hundreds. If Laud had gone zealously to work in emptying Puritan pulpits, his zeal had been to a great extent foiled by the restrictions of the law and by the growth of Puritan sentiment in the clergy as a whole. A far wider change had been brought about by the Civil War; but the change had been gradual, and had been wrought for the most part on political or moral rather than on religious grounds. The parsons expelled were expelled as royalists or as unfitted for their office by idleness or vice or inability to preach. The change wrought by St. Bartholomew's day was a distinctly religious change, and it was a change which in its suddenness and completeness stood utterly alone. The rectors and vicars who were driven out were the most learned and the most active of their order. The bulk of the great livings throughout the country were in their hands. They stood at the head of the London clergy, as the London clergy stood in general repute at the head of their class throughout

nd. They occupied the higher posts at the two Universities. English divine, save Jeremy Taylor, rivalled Howe as a preacher. A person was so renowned a controversialist, or so indefatigable English priest, as Baxter. And behind these men stood a fifth whole body of the clergy, men whose zeal and labour had led throughout the country a greater appearance of piety and more than it had ever displayed before. But the expulsion of men was far more to the Church of England than the loss of individual services. It was the definite expulsion of a great which from the time of the Reformation had played the active and popular part in the life of the Church. It was the of an effort which had been going on ever since Elizabeth's sion to bring the English Communion into closer relations he Reformed Communions of the Continent, and into greater ony with the religious instincts of the nation at large. The h of England stood from that moment isolated and alone gall the churches of the Christian world. The Reformation evered it irretrievably from those which still clung to the ence of the Papacy. By its rejection of all but episcopal s, the Act of Uniformity severed it as irretrievably from the al body of the Protestant Churches, whether Lutheran or med. And while thus cut off from all healthy religious union with the world without, it sank into immobility 1. With the expulsion of the Puritan clergy, all change, all s after reform, all national development, suddenly stopped. that time to this the Episcopal Church has been unable to the varying spiritual needs of its adherents by any modifica- of its government or its worship. It stands alone among all igious bodies of Western Christendom in its failure through undred years to devise a single new service of prayer or of . But if the issues of St. Bartholomew's day have been ul to the spiritual life of the English Church, they have been highest degree advantageous to the cause of religious liberty. e Restoration religious freedom seemed again to have been Only the Independents and a few despised sects, such as the ers, upheld the right of every man to worship God according bidding of his own conscience. The great bulk of the Puritan , with the Presbyterians at its head, were at one with their ents in desiring a uniformity of worship, if not of belief, ghout the land; and, had the two great parties within the h held together, their weight would have been almost irre- le. Fortunately the great severance of St. Bartholomew's rove out the Presbyterians from the Church to which they , and forced them into a general union with sects which they ated till then almost as bitterly as the bishops themselves. amon persecution soon blended the Nonconformists into one. ution broke down before the numbers, the wealth, and the cal weight of the new sectarians; and the Church, for the ime in its history, found itself confronted with an organized

1660
to
1667

body of Dissenters without its pale. The impossibility of crushing such a body as this wrested from English statesmen the first legal recognition of freedom of worship in the Toleration Act; their rapid growth in later times has by degrees stripped the Church of almost all the exclusive privileges which it enjoyed as a religious body, and now threatens what remains of its official connection with the State. With these remoter consequences however we are not as yet concerned. It is enough to note here that with the Act of Uniformity and the expulsion of the Puritan clergy a new element in our religious and political history, the element of Dissent, the influence of the Nonconformist churches, comes first into play.

The
Persecu-
tion

The immediate effect of their expulsion on the Puritans was to beget a feeling of despair. Many were for retiring to Holland, others proposed flight to New England and the American colonies. Charles however was anxious to make use of them in carrying out his schemes for a toleration of the Catholics; and fresh hopes of protection were raised by a Royal proclamation, which expressed the King's wish to exempt from the penalties of the Act "those who, living peaceably, do not conform themselves thereunto, through scruple and tenderness of misguided conscience, but modestly and without scandal perform their devotions in their own way." Charles promised to bring a measure to this effect before Parliament in its coming session. The bill which was thus introduced would have enabled the King to dispense, not only with the provisions of the Act of Uniformity, but with all laws and statutes enforcing conformity in worship, or imposing religious tests. Its aim was so obvious, and its unconstitutional character so clear, that even the Nonconformists withdrew from supporting it; and Ashley alone among the Puritan leaders undertook its defence. The threatening attitude of the Commons soon forced the King to withdraw it; but the temper of the Church was now roused, and the hatred of the Nonconformists was embittered by suspicions of the King's secret designs. The Houses extorted from Charles a proclamation for the banishment of Roman Catholic priests; and by their Conventicle Act of the following year, they punished by fine, imprisonment, and transportation, all meetings of more than five persons for any religious worship but that of the Common Prayer. The Five Mile Act, a year later, completed the code of persecution. By its provisions, every clergyman who had been driven out by the Act of Uniformity was called on to swear that he held it unlawful under any pretext to take up arms against the King, and that he would at no time "endeavour any alteration of government in Church or State." In case of refusal, he was forbidden to go within five miles of any borough, or of any place where he had been wont to minister. As the main body of the Nonconformists belonged to the city and trading classes, the effect of this measure was to rob them of any religious teaching at all. But the tide of religious intolerance was now slowly ebbing, and a motion to impose the oath of the Five Mile Act on every person

1663

1664

1665

1660
to
1687

the nation was rejected in the same session by a majority of six. sufferings of the Nonconformists indeed could hardly fail to win the sympathies of the people. The thirst for revenge, which had been roused by the tyranny of the Presbyterians in their hour of triumph, was satisfied by their humiliation in the hour of defeat. The sight of pious and learned clergymen driven from their homes and their flocks, of religious meetings broken up by the tables, of preachers set side by side with thieves and outcasts in the dock, of gaols crammed with honest enthusiasts whose piety and their only crime, pleaded more eloquently for toleration than any reasoning in the world. We have a clue to the extent of the persecution from what we know to have been its effect on a single

The Quakers had excited alarm by their extravagances of dress, their refusal to bear arms or to take oaths; and a special law was passed for their repression. They were one of the smallest of the Nonconformist bodies, but more than four thousand were in prison, and of these five hundred were imprisoned in London alone. Large as it was, the number rapidly increased; and the King's Declaration of Indulgence, twelve years later, set free five thousand Quakers who had found their way to the gaols. The sufferings of the expelled clergy one of their own number, Richard Baxter, has given us an account. "Many hundreds of ministers, with their wives and children, had neither house nor bread. Their congregations had enough to do, besides a small maintenance, to help them out of prisons, or to maintain them there. Though they were as frugal as possible they could hardly live; they lived on little more than brown bread and water, many had eight or ten pounds a year to maintain a family, so that a piece of silver has not come to one of their tables in six weeks' time; an allowance could scarce afford them bread and cheese. One man to plow six days and preached on the Lord's Day. Another was forced to cut tobacco for a livelihood." But poverty was the worst of their sufferings. They were jeered at by the players. They were hooted through the streets by the mob. "Many of the ministers, being afraid to lay down their ministry after they had been ordained to it, preached to such as would hear them in fields or private houses, till they were apprehended and cast into gaols, and many of them perished." They were excommunicated in the consistory Court, or fined for non-attendance at church; and a number of informers grew up who made a trade of detecting the ministers they held at midnight. Alleyn, the author of the well-known "Alarm to the Unconverted," died at thirty-six from the sufferings he endured in Taunton Gaol. Vavasour Powell, the son of Wales, spent the eleven years which followed the Restoration in prisons at Shrewsbury, Southsea, and Cardiff, till he died in the Fleet. John Bunyan was for twelve years a prisoner at Bedford.

We have already seen the atmosphere of excited feeling in which the youth of Bunyan had been spent. From his childhood he heard

1660 heavenly voices, and saw visions of heaven; from his childhood,
 to he had been wrestling with an overpowering sense of sin, which
 1667 sickness and repeated escapes from death did much as he grew up
 — to deepen. But in spite of his self-reproaches his life was a religious
 he one; and the purity and sobriety of his youth was shown by his
 pilgrim's admission at seventeen into the ranks of the "New Model." Two
 progress years later the war was over, and Bunyan found himself married
 1645 before he was twenty to a "godly" wife, as young and as poor as
 himself. So poor were the young couple that they could hardly
 muster a spoon and a plate between them; and the poverty of
 their home deepened, perhaps, the gloom of the young tinker's
 restlessness and religious depression. His wife did what she could
 to comfort him, teaching him again to read and write, for he had
 forgotten his school-learning, and reading with him in two little
 "godly" books which formed his library. But the darkness only
 gathered the thicker round his imaginative soul. "I walked," he
 tells us of this time, "to a neighbouring town; and sate down upon
 a settle in the street, and fell into a very deep pause about the most
 fearful state my sin had brought me to; and after long musing I
 lifted up my head; but methought I saw as if the sun that shineth
 in the heavens did grudge to give me light; and as if the very
 stones in the street and tiles upon the houses did band themselves
 against me. Methought that they all combined together to banish
 me out of the world. I was abhorred of them, and wept to dwell
 among them, because I had sinned against the Saviour. Oh, how
 happy now was every creature over I! for they stood fast and kept
 1653 their station. But I was gone and lost." At last, after more than
 two years of this struggle, the darkness broke. Bunyan felt himself
 "converted," and freed from the burthen of his sin. He joined a
 Baptist church at Bedford, and a few years later he became famous
 as a preacher. As he held no formal post of minister in the con-
 gregation, his preaching even under the Protectorate was illegal
 and "gave great offence," he tells us, "to the doctors and priests
 of that county," but he persisted with little real molestation until
 the Restoration. Six months after the King's return he was com-
 mitted to Bedford Gaol on a charge of preaching in unlicensed
 conventicles; and his refusal to promise to abstain from preaching
 kept him there eleven years. The gaol was crowded with prisoners
 like himself, and amongst them he continued his ministry, support-
 ing himself by making tagged thread laces, and finding some
 comfort in the Bible, the "Book of Martyrs," and the writing
 materials which he was suffered to have with him in his prison.
 But he was in the prime of life; his age was thirty-two when he
 was imprisoned; and the inactivity and severance from his wife
 and little children was hard to bear. "The parting with my wife
 and poor children," he says in words of simple pathos, "hath often
 been to me in this place as the pulling of the flesh from the bones,
 and that not only because I am somewhat too fond of those great
 mercies, but also because I should have often brought to my mind

many hardships, miseries, and wants that my poor family was to meet with should I be taken from them, especially my poor child, who lay nearer to my heart than all besides. Oh, the thoughts of the hardships I thought my poor blind one might go through would break my heart to pieces. 'Poor child,' thought I, 'what sorrow art thou like to have for thy portion in this world! thou must be beaten, must beg, suffer hunger, cold, nakedness, and a thousand calamities, though I cannot now endure the wind should blow upon thee.' " But suffering could not break his resolve, and Bunyan found compensation for the narrow bounds of his prison in the wonderful activity of his pen. Tracts, conversational treatises, poems, meditations, his "Grace Abounding," and his "Holy City," followed each other in quick succession. It was in his gaol that he wrote the first and greatest part of his *Pilgrim's Progress*. In no book do we see more clearly the new imaginative force which had been given to the common life of Englishmen by their study of the Bible. Its English is the simplest and the homeliest English which has ever been used by any great English writer; but it is the English of the Bible. The images of "*Pilgrim's Progress*" are the images of prophet and evangelist; it borrows for its tenderer outbursts the very verse of the Song of Songs, and pictures the Heavenly City in the words of the Apocalypse. But so completely has the Bible become Bunyan's life that he feels its phrases as the natural expression of his thoughts. He has lived in the Bible till its words have become his own. He has dwelt among its visions and voices of heaven till all sense of possible reality has died away. He tells his tale with such a perfect naturalness that allegories become living things, that the Slough Despond and Doubting Castle are as real to us as places we see every day, that we know Mr. Legality and Mr. Worldly Wiseman as if we had met them in the street. It is in this amazing reality and impersonation that Bunyan's imaginative genius specially displays itself. But this is far from being his only excellence. In its directness, in its simple grace, in the ease with which it changes from lively dialogue to dramatic action, from simple honest passion to passionate earnestness, in the subtle and delicate fancy which often suffuses its childlike words, in its playful humour, in its bold character-painting, in the even and balanced power which carries without effort from the Valley of the Shadow of Death to the land "where the Shining Ones commonly walked, because it is on the borders of heaven," in its sunny kindliness, unbroken by one bitter word, the "*Pilgrim's Progress*" is among the noblest English poems. For if Puritanism had first discovered the poetry of each contact with the spiritual world awakes in the meanest souls, Bunyan was the first of the Puritans who revealed this poetry to the outer world. The journey of Christian from the City of Destruction to the Heavenly City is simply a record of the life of such a Puritan as Bunyan himself, seen through an imaginative haze of spiritual idealism in which its commonest incidents are heightened

1660
to
1687

1670
to
1671

1660 and glorified. He is himself the Pilgrim who flies from the City of
to Destruction, who climbs the hill Difficulty, who faces Apollyon,
1667 who sees his loved ones cross the river of Death towards the
Heavenly City, and how, because "the hill on which the City was
framed was higher than the clouds, they therefore went up through
the region of the air, sweetly talking as they went."

he The popularity which the "Pilgrim's Progress" enjoyed from
/ar the first proves that the religious sympathies of the English people
ith were still mainly Puritan. Before Bunyan's death in 1688 ten
olland editions of the book had already been sold, and though even
Cowper hardly dared to quote it for fear of moving a sneer in the
polite world of his day, its favour among the middle classes and
the poor has grown steadily from its author's day to our own. It
is probably the most popular and the most widely known of all
English books. But the inner current of the national life had little
relation to the outer history of the Restoration. While Bunyan
was lying in Bedford Gaol, and the Church was carrying on its
bitter persecution of the Nonconformists, England was plunging
into a series of humiliations and losses without example in his
history. The fatal strife with Holland which had been closed by
1664 the wisdom of Cromwell was renewed. The quarrel of the Dutch
and English merchants on the Guinea coast, where both sought a
monopoly of the trade in gold dust and slaves, was fanned by the
ambition of the Duke of York and by the resentment of Charles
himself at the insults he had suffered from Holland in his exile into
a war. An obstinate battle off Lowestoft ended in a victory for the
English fleet; but in a subsequent encounter with De Ruyter off
1665 the North Foreland Monk and his fleet were only saved from
destruction by the arrival of a reinforcement under Prince Rupert.
"They may be killed," said De Witt, "but they cannot be con-
quered;" and the saying was as true of one side as of the other.
A third battle, as hard-fought as its predecessors, ended in the
triumph of the English, and their fleet sailed along the coast of
Holland, burning ships and towns. But the thought of triumph
was soon forgotten in the terrible calamities which fell on the capital.
In six months a hundred thousand Londoners died of the Plague
which broke out in its crowded streets; and the Plague was
followed by a fire, which beginning near Fish Street reduced the
666 whole city to ashes from the Tower to the Temple. Thirteen
hundred houses and ninety churches were destroyed. The loss of
merchandise and property was beyond count. The Treasury was
empty, and neither ships nor forts were manned, when the Dutch
fleet appeared in the Nore, advanced unopposed up the Thames
667 to Gravesend, forced the boom which protected the Medway, burnt
three men-of-war which lay anchored in the river, and for six weeks
sailed proudly along the southern coast, the masters of the Channel.

Charles appears to have exercised his influence generally rather on the
side of moderation than of revenge; the House of Lords was anxious
to adopt more severe measures than were actually taken.

SECTION III.—CHARLES THE SECOND, 1667—1673

1667
to
1673

Authorities.—To those mentioned under the previous section may be added the "Grammont Memoirs," for the court scandal of the period; Kennet's "Register," and his anonymous "Complete History of England"; North's "Examen, an answer to Kennet"; and the indices to Dalrymple's "Memoirs." For foreign policy, Mignet, *Négociations relatives à la Succession d'Espagne*, and Lefèvre-Follain, "Jean de Witt." Lingard's "History of England" is especially valuable for this period; see also Macaulay's "History of England." For Shaftesbury, see the most complete biography of that statesman.]

The thunder of the Dutch guns in the Medway and the Thames reduced England to a bitter sense of its degradation. The dream of glory was over. "Everybody now-a-days," Pepys tells us, "reflect upon Oliver and commend him, what brave things he did, and made all the neighbour princes fear him." But Oliver's successor was coolly watching this shame and discontent of his people with the one aim of turning it to his own advantage. To Charles the Second the degradation of England was only a move in the political game which he was playing, a game played with so much subtlety and skill that it deceived not only the most observant of his own day but still misleads historians of the present. What his subjects saw in their King was a pleasant, brown-skinned gentleman playing with his spaniels, or drawing caricatures of his ministers, or flinging cakes to the water-fowl in the park. On the outer seeming Charles was the most consummate of idlers. "The King is delighted," says one of his courtiers, "in a bewitching kind of pleasure called sauntering." The business-like Pepys soon discovered that "the King do mind nothing but pleasures, and hates very sight or thoughts of business." He only laughed when a Killigrew frankly told him that badly as things were going on, there was one man whose employment would soon set them right, and this is one Charles Stuart, who now spends his time in idling his lips about the Court, and hath no other employment." But Charles had great natural parts no one doubted. In his earlier days of defeat and danger he showed a cool courage and presence of mind which never failed him in the many perilous moments of his reign. His temper was pleasant and social, his manners perfect, there was a careless freedom and courtesy in his address which won over everybody who came into his presence. His education had been so grossly neglected that he could hardly read a Latin book; but his natural quickness and intelligence showed itself in his pursuit of chemistry and anatomy, and in the rest he showed in the scientific inquiries of the Royal Society. Like Peter the Great, his favourite study was that of naval architecture, and he piqued himself on being a clever ship-builder. He had some little love too for art and poetry, and a taste for music. His shrewdness and vivacity showed itself most in his endless

Charles
the
Second

1667
to
1673

talk. He was fond of telling stories, and he told them with a good deal of grace and humour. His humour indeed never forsook him: even on his death-bed he turned to the weeping courtiers around and whispered an apology for having been so unconscionable a time in dying. He held his own fairly with the wits of his Court, and bandied repartees on equal terms with Sedley or Buckingham. Even Rochester in his merciless epigram was forced to own that "Charles never said a foolish thing." He had inherited in fact his grandfather's gift of pithy sayings, and his cynical irony often gave an amusing turn to them. When his brother, the most unpopular man in England, solemnly warned him of plots against his life, Charles laughingly bid him set all fear aside. "They will never kill me, James," he said, "to make you king." But courage and wit and ability seemed to have been bestowed on him in vain. Charles hated business. He gave no sign of ambition. The one thing he seemed in earnest about was sensual pleasure, and he took his pleasure with a cynical shamelessness which roused the disgust even of his shameless courtiers. Mistress followed mistress, and the guilt of a troop of profligate women was blazoned to the world by the gift of titles and estates. The Royal bastards were set amongst English nobles. The Ducal house of Grafton springs from the King's adultery with Barbara Palmer, whom he created Duchess of Cleveland. The Dukes of St. Albans owe their origin to his intrigue with Nell Gwynn, a player and a courtesan. Louise de Querouaille, a mistress sent by France to win him to its interests, became Duchess of Portsmouth, and ancestress of the house of Richmond. An earlier mistress, Lucy Walters, had made him father in younger days of the boy whom he raised to the Dukedom of Monmouth, and to whom the Dukes of Buccleugh trace their line. But Charles was far from being content with these recognized mistresses, or with a single form of self-indulgence. Gambling and drinking helped to fill up the vacant moments when he could no longer toy with his favourites or bet at Newmarket. No thought of remorse or of shame seems ever to have crossed his mind. "He could not think God would make a man miserable," he said once, "only for taking a little pleasure out of the way." From shame indeed he was shielded by his cynical disbelief in human virtue. Virtue he regarded simply as a trick by which clever hypocrites imposed upon fools. Honour among men seemed to him as mere a pretence as chastity among women. Gratitude he had none, for he looked upon self-interest as the only motive of men's actions, and though soldiers had died and women had risked their lives for him, he "loved others as little as he thought they loved him." But if he felt no gratitude for benefits he felt no resentment for wrongs. He was incapable either of love or of hate. The only feeling he retained for his fellow-men was that of an amused contempt.

The
King's
policy

It was difficult for Englishmen to believe that any real danger to liberty could come from an idler and a voluptuary such as Charles the Second. But in the very difficulty of believing this lay half the

g's strength. He had in fact no taste whatever for the despotism of the Stuarts who had gone before him. His shrewdness laughed at his grandfather's theories of Divine Right down the wind. His silence made such a personal administration as that which his father delighted in burthensome to him: he was too humorous and too careless to care for the pomp and show of power, and too good-natured even to play the tyrant. "He told Lord Essex," Burnet says, "that he did not wish to be like a Grand Signior, with some mutes to attend him, and bags of bowstrings to strangle men; but he did not think he was a king so long as a company of fellows were looking into his actions, and examining his ministers as well as his subjects." "A king," he thought, "who might be checked, and whose ministers called to an account, was but a king in name." In other words, he had no settled plan of tyranny, but he meant to rule as independently as he could, and from the beginning to the end of his reign there never was a moment when he was not doing something to carry out his aim. But he carried it out in a haphazard, irregular fashion which it was as hard to detect as to thwart. Whenever there was any strong opposition he gave way. Popular feeling demanded the dismissal of his ministers, he dismissed them. If it protested against his declaration of Indulgence, he recalled it. If it cried for victims in the frenzy of the Irish Plot, he gave it victims till the frenzy was at an end. It was as easy for Charles to yield and to wait, and just as easy for him to take up the thread of his purpose again the moment the pressure was over. The one fixed resolve which overrode every other thought in the King's mind was a resolve "not to set out on his travels again." His father had fallen through a quarrel with the two Houses, and Charles was determined to remain on good terms with Parliament till he was strong enough to pick a quarrel with his father. He treated the Lords with an easy familiarity which robbed the position of its seriousness. "Their debates amused him," he wrote in his indolent way; and he stood chatting before the fire while one peer after peer poured invectives on his ministers, and he laughed louder than the rest when Shaftesbury directed his coarsest attacks at the barrenness of the Queen. Courtiers were entrusted with the secret "management" of the Commons: obstinate country gentlemen were brought to the Royal closet to kiss the King's hand and listen to the King's pleasant stories of his escape from Worcester; and yet more obstinate country gentlemen were rebuffed. Where bribes, flattery, and management failed, Charles was content to yield and to wait till his time came again. Meanwhile he went on patiently gathering up what fragments of the old royal power still survived, and availing himself of whatever new resources offered themselves. If he could not undo what Puritanism had done in England, he could undo its work in Scotland and in Ireland. Before the Civil War these kingdoms had served as useful checks on English liberty, and by simply regarding the Union with the Long Parliament and the Protector had brought about

1687
to
1673

as a nullity in law it was possible they might become checks again. In his undoing the Union Charles was supported by Clarendon and the Constitutional loyalists, partly from sheer abhorrence of changes wrought by their political opponents, and partly from a dread that the Scotch and Irish members would form a party in the English Parliament which would always be at the service of the Crown. In both the lesser kingdoms too a measure which seemed to restore somewhat of their independence was for the moment popular. But the results of this step were quick in developing themselves. In Scotland the Covenant was at once abolished. The new Scotch Parliament at Edinburgh, which soon won the name of the Drunken Parliament, outdid the wildest loyalty of the English Cavaliers by annulling in a single Act all the proceedings of its predecessors during the last eight-and-twenty years. By this measure the whole Church system of Scotland fell legally to the ground. The General Assembly had already been prohibited from meeting by Cromwell; the kirk-sessions and ministers' synods were now suspended. The bishops were again restored to their spiritual pre-eminence, and to their seats in Parliament. An iniquitous trial sent the Earl of Argyle, the only noble strong enough to oppose the Royal will, to the block. The government was entrusted to a knot of profligate statesmen who were directed by Lord Lauderdale, one of the ablest and most unscrupulous of the King's ministers; and their policy was steadily directed to the two purposes of humbling Presbyterianism—as the force which could alone restore Scotland to freedom and enable her to lend aid as before to English liberty in any struggle with the Crown—and of raising a Royal army which might be ready in case of trial to march over the border to the King's support. In Ireland the dissolution of the Union brought back the bishops to their sees; but whatever wish Charles may have had to restore the balance of Catholic and Protestant as a source of power to the Crown was baffled by the obstinate resistance of the Protestant settlers to any plans for redressing the confiscations of Cromwell. Five years of bitter struggle between the dispossessed loyalists and the new occupants left the Protestant ascendancy unimpaired; and in spite of a nominal surrender of one-third of the confiscated estates to their old possessors, hardly a sixth of the profitable land in the island remained in Catholic holding. The claims of the Duke of Ormond too made it necessary to leave the government in his hands, and Ormond's loyalty was too moderate and constitutional to lend itself to any of the schemes of absolute rule which under Tyrconnell played so great a part in the next reign. But the severance of the two kingdoms from England was in itself a gain to the Royal authority; and Charles turned quickly to the building up of a Royal army at home. A standing army had become so hateful a thing to the body of the nation, and above all to the Royalists whom the New Model had trodden under foot, that it was impossible to propose its establishment. But in the mind of

h the Royal brothers their father's downfall had been owing to want of a disciplined force which would have trampled out the efforts of national resistance; and while disbanding the New Model, Charles availed himself of the alarm created by a mad reg of some Fifth-Monarchy men in London under an old soldier called Venner to retain five thousand horse and foot in his service under the name of his guards. A body of "gentlemen of quality" veteran soldiers, excellently clad, mounted, and ordered," was kept ready for service near the Royal person; and in spite of the scandal which it aroused the King persisted, steadily but cautiously, in gradually increasing its numbers. Twenty years after it had grown to a force of seven thousand foot and one thousand seven hundred horse and dragoons at home, with a reserve of six fine regiments abroad in the service of the United Provinces.

But Charles was too quick-witted a man to believe, as his brother James believed, that it was possible to break down English freedom by the Royal power or by a few thousand men in arms. It was still possible by such means to break down, as he wished to break down, English Protestantism. In heart, whether the story of his conversion to Protestantism during his exile be true or no, he had ceased to be a Protestant. Whatever religious feeling he had on the side of Catholicism; he encouraged conversions among courtiers, and the last act of his life was to seek formal admission to the Roman Church. But his feelings were rather political than religious. He saw that despotism in the State could hardly co-exist with free inquiry and free action in matters of the conscience, that government, in his own words, "was a safer and easier thing where the authority was believed infallible and the faith and mission of the people were implicit." The difficulties of a change of religion probably seemed the less to him that he had long lived abroad, where the sight of a people changing its belief with a change of sovereign's faith was not a very rare one. But though he rested much on the dissensions between Protestant Churchmen and Protestant Dissenters, and two years after his accession attached a secret agent to Rome to arrange a reconciliation with Papacy, he saw that for any real success in his political or religious aims he must seek resources elsewhere than at home. At this moment France was the dominant power in Europe. Its young King, Lewis the Fourteenth, avowed himself the champion of Catholicism and despotism against civil and religious liberty throughout the world. France was the wealthiest of European powers, and her subsidies could free Charles from dependence on Parliament. Her army was the finest in the world, and French soldiers could put down any resistance from English patriots. The young Lewis could alone realize the aims of Charles, and Charles freed by nature from any shame or reluctance to pay the price which Lewis demanded for his aid. The price was that of a silent acquiescence in his designs on Spain. Robbed of its chief source of

1667
to
1673

Charles
and
France

1667 wealth by the revolt of the United Provinces and the decay of
to Flanders, enfeebled within by the persecution of the Inquisition,
1673 by the suppression of civil freedom, and by a ruinous financial
oppression, Spain had not only ceased to threaten Europe but
herself trembled at the threats of France. The aim of Lewis was to
rob it of the Low Countries, but the presence of the French in
Flanders was equally distasteful to England and to Holland, and
in such a contest Spain was sure of the aid both of these states and
of the Empire. For some years Lewis contented himself with
perfecting his army and preparing by skilful negotiations to make
such a league of the great powers against him impossible. His
first success in England was in the marriage of the King. Portugal,
which had only just shaken off the rule of Spain, was really
dependent upon France; and in accepting the hand of Catharine
of Braganza in spite of the protests of Spain, Charles announced his
adhesion to the alliance of Lewis. Already English opinion saw the
danger of such a course, and veered round to the Spanish side. As
early as 1661 the London mob backed the Spanish ambassador in a
street squabble for precedence with the ambassador of France.
"We do all naturally love the Spanish," says Pepys, "and hate
the French." The sale of Dunkirk, the one result of Cromwell's
victories, to France fanned the national irritation to frenzy; and
the war with Holland seemed at one time likely to end in a war
with Lewis. The war was in itself a serious stumbling-block in the
way of his projects. To aid either side was to throw the other on
the aid of Austria and Spain, and to build up a league which would
check France in its aims; and yet the peace which could alone
enable Lewis to seize Flanders by keeping the states of Europe dis-
united was impossible without some sort of intervention. He was
forced therefore to give aid to Holland, and the news of his purpose
at once roused England to a hope of war. When Charles announced
it to the Houses, "there was a great noise," says Louvois, "in the
Parliament to show the joy of the two Houses at the prospect of a
fight with us." But the dexterous delays of Charles were seconded
by the skill with which Lewis limited his aid to the exact force
which was needful to bring about a close of the war, and the sudden
conclusion of peace again left the ground clear for his diplomatic
intrigues.

The In England the irritation was great and universal, but it took a
Fall of turn which helped to carry out the plans of the King. From the
Clarendon. moment when his bill to vest a dispensing power in the Crown had
been defeated by Clarendon's stubborn opposition, Charles had
resolved to rid himself of the Chancellor. The Presbyterian party,
represented by Ashley, united with Arlington and the ministers
1663 who were really in favour of Catholicism to bring about his over-
throw. But Clarendon was still strong in the support of the House
of Commons, whose Churchmanship was as resolute as his own.
Foiled in their efforts to displace him, his rivals availed themselves
of the jealousy of the merchant-class to drive him against his will

the war with Holland; and though the Chancellor succeeded forcing the Five Mile Act through the two Houses in the teeth of Ashley's protests, the calculations of his enemies were soon verified. The failures and shame of the war broke the union between Clarendon and Parliament; his pride and venality had made him unpopular with the nation at large; and the threat of an impeachment enabled Charles to gratify his long-hoarded revenge the dismissal of the Chancellor from his office, and by an order to quit the realm. By the exile of Clarendon, the death of Southampton, and the retirement of Ormond and Nicholas, the Cavalier party in the Council ceased to exist; and the section which had finally represented the Presbyterians, and which under the influence of Ashley had struggled in vain for toleration against the churchmen and the Parliament, came to the front of affairs. The religious policy of Charles had as yet been defeated by the sturdy churchmanship of the Parliament, the influence of Clarendon, and the reluctance of the Presbyterians as a body to accept the Royal "indulgence" at the price of a toleration of Catholicism and a recognition of the King's power to dispense with Parliamentary statutes. But there were signs in the recent conduct of the Parliament and in its break with the Chancellor that the policy of persecution had been overdone. Charles trusted that the pressure on the Nonconformists by the Conventicle Act and the Five Mile Act would drive them to seek relief at almost any cost, and he had proposed a general toleration. He looked to Ashley and his party for support. But their temper was already changed. Instead of toleration they pressed for a union of Protestants which would utterly foiled the King's projects; and a scheme of Protestant apprehension, which had been approved by the moderate divines on both sides, by Tillotson and Stillingfleet on the part of the church, as well as by Manton and Baxter on the part of the Nonconformists, was laid by the new Minister before the House of Commons. Even its rejection failed to bring Ashley and his party back to their old position. They were still for toleration, but only a toleration the benefit of which did not extend to Catholics, in respect the laws have determined the principles of the Romish religion to be inconsistent with the safety of your Majesty's person and government." The policy of the Council at home was determined, indeed, by the look of public affairs abroad. Lewis had clearly shown the real cause of the eagerness with which he had signed on the Peace of Breda between England and the Dutch. He had secured the non-interference of the Emperor by a secret treaty which shared the Spanish dominions between the two arch-enemies in case the King of Spain died without an heir. England, as he believed, was held in check by Charles, and Holland was too exhausted by the late war to interfere alone. On the very day before on which the treaty was signed he sent in his formal demands on the Low Countries; his army at once took the field, and the fall of six fortresses without resistance left Turenne master of

1667
to
1673
—
1665

1667

1669

1667

1667
to
1673

Flanders. Holland at once protested and armed; but it could do nothing without aid, and its appeal to England remained unanswered. Lewis was ready to pay a high price for English neutrality. He offered to admit England to a share in the eventual partition of the Spanish monarchy, and to assign to her the American possessions of the Spanish crown, if she would assent to his schemes on the Low Countries. Charles was already, in fact, engaged in secret negotiations on this basis, but the projects of the King were soon checked by the threatening tone of the Parliament, and by the attitude of his own ministers. To Ashley and his followers an increase of the French power seemed dangerous to English Protestantism. Even Arlington, Catholic as in heart he was, thought more of the political interests of England, and of the invariable resolve of its statesmen since Elizabeth's day to keep the French out of Flanders, than of the interests of Catholicism. Lewis, warned of his danger, still strove to win over English opinion by offers of peace on moderate terms, while he was writing to Turenne, "I am turning over in my head things that are far from impossible, and go to carry them into execution whatever they may cost." Three armies were, in fact, ready to march on Spain, Germany, and Flanders, when Arlington despatched Sir William Temple to the Hague, and the signature of a Triple Alliance between England, Holland, and Sweden bound Lewis to the terms he had offered as a blind, and forced on him the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle.

1668

The
Treaty
of
Dover

Few measures have won a greater popularity than the Triple Alliance. "It is the only good public thing," says Pepys, "that hath been done since the King came to England." Even the Tory Dryden counted among the worst of Shaftesbury's crimes that "the Triple Bond he broke." In form indeed the Alliance simply bound Lewis to adhere to terms of peace proposed by himself, and those advantageous terms. But, in fact, as we have seen, it utterly ruined his plans. It brought about that union of the powers of Europe against which, as he felt instinctively, his ambition would dash itself in vain. It was Arlington's aim to make the Alliance the nucleus of a greater confederation; and he tried not only to perpetuate it, but to include within it the Swiss Cantons, the Empire, and the House of Austria. His efforts were foiled; but the "Triple Bond" bore within it the germs of the Grand Alliance which at last saved Europe. To England it at once brought back the reputation which she had lost since the death of Cromwell. It was, in fact, a return to the Protector's policy of a league with the Protestant powers of the North as a security against the aggression of the Catholic powers of the South. But it was not so much the action of England which had galled the pride of Lewis, as the energy and success of Holland. That "a nation of shopkeepers" (for Lewis applied the phrase to Holland long before Napoleon applied it to England) should have foiled his plans at the very moment of their realization, "stung him," he owned, "to the quick." If he refrained from an instant attack it was to nurse a

er revenge. His steady aim during the three years which owed the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle was to isolate the United Provinces, to bring about again the neutrality of the Empire, to break the Triple Alliance by detaching Sweden and by securing Charles, and to leave his prey without help, save from the idle goodwill of Brandenburg and Spain. His diplomacy was everywhere successful, but it was nowhere so successful as with England. Charles had been stirred to a momentary pride by the success of

1667
to
1673

Triple Alliance, but he had never seriously abandoned his policy, and he was resolute at last to play an active part in realizing

It was clear that little was to be hoped for from his old plans uniting the Catholics and the Nonconformists, and from this moment he surrendered himself utterly to France. The Triple Alliance was hardly concluded when he declared to Lewis his pose of entering into an alliance with him, offensive and defensive. He owned to being the only man in his kingdom who desired such a league, but he was determined to realize his desire, whatever might be the sentiments of his ministers. His ministers, indeed, he meant either to bring over to his schemes or to outwit.

Two of them, Arlington and Sir Thomas Clifford, were Catholics in private like the King; and they were summoned, with the Duke of York, who had already secretly embraced Catholicism, to a conference in which Charles, after pledging them to secrecy, declared himself a Catholic, and asked their counsel as to the means of establishing the Catholic religion in his realm. It was resolved by

1669

four to apply to Lewis for aid in this purpose; and Charles proceeded to seek from the King a "protection," to use the words of the French ambassador, "of which he has always hoped to feel powerful effects in the execution of his design of changing the present state of religion in England for a better, and of establishing authority so as to be able to retain his subjects in the obedience they owe him." He offered to declare his religion, and to join France in an attack on Holland, if Lewis would grant him a subsidy equal to a million a year. On this basis a secret treaty was negotiated the year 1670 at Dover between Charles and his sister Henrietta,

1670

Duchess of Orleans. It provided that Charles should announce conversion, and that in case of any disturbance arising from a step he should be supported by a French army and a French subsidy. War was to be declared by both powers against Holland, Holland furnishing a small land force, but bearing the chief burthen of the contest at sea, on condition of an annual subsidy of three millions of francs. In the event of the King of Spain's death without a son, Charles promised to support France in her claims in Flanders.

Nothing marks better the political profligacy of the age than the fact that Arlington, the author of the Triple Alliance, should have been chosen as the confidant of Charles in his Treaty of Dover. But to leave Arlington and Clifford the King's change of religion or his political aims remained utterly unknown. It would have been

The Declaration of Indulgence

1667
to
1673

h its parties. Ashley was made Chancellor and Earl of Shaftesbury, and Clifford became Lord Treasurer. But the Dutch were sed by the pride with which Lewis rejected their offers of submission, and by the approach of winter which suspended his rations. The plot of the two Courts hung for success on the nces of a rapid surprise; and with the appointment of the ng Prince of Orange to the command of the Dutch army all nce of a surprise was over. Young as he was, William of Orange nce displayed the cool courage and tenacity of his race. "Do not see your country is lost?" asked the Duke of Buckingham, had been sent to negotiate at the Hague. "There is a suror never to see it lost," replied William, "and that is, to die in last ditch." The unexpected delay forced on Charles a fresh mbly of the Parliament; for the supplies which he had so rupulously procured were already exhausted, while the closing he Treasury had shaken all credit and rendered it impossible ise a loan. It was necessary in 1673 to appeal to the Commons, the Commons met in a mood of angry distrust. The war, opular as it was, they left alone. What overpowered all other ngs was a vague sense, which we know now to have been ified by the facts, that liberty and religion were being un- pulously betrayed. There was a suspicion that the whole ed force of the nation was in Catholic hands. The Duke of k was believed to be in heart a Papist, and he was in command ie fleet. Catholics had been placed as officers in the force which being raised for the war in Holland, and a French general, the nt of Schomberg, had been sent to take command of it. Lady domaine, the King's mistress, paraded her conversion; and ots were fast gathering over the Protestantism of the King. re was a general suspicion that a plot was on foot for the blishment of Catholicism and despotism, and that the war and Indulgence were parts of the plot. The change of temper in Commons was marked by the appearance of what was from time called the Country party, with Lords Russell and ndish and Sir William Coventry at its head, a party which pathized with the Nonconformists but looked on it as its first r to guard against the designs of the Court. As to the Declara- of Indulgence however, all parties in the House were at one. Commons resolved "that penal statutes in matters ecclesi- al cannot be suspended but by consent of Parliament," and sed supplies till the Declaration was recalled. The King yielded; the Declaration was no sooner recalled than a Test Act was ed through both Houses without opposition, which required t everyone in the civil and military employment of the State oaths of allegiance and supremacy, a declaration against tran- tantiation, and a reception of the sacrament according to the of the Church of England. Clifford at once counselled resist- , and Buckingham talked flightily about bringing the army to don, but Arlington saw that all hope of carrying the "great

1673 plan" through was at an end, and pressed Charles to yield. A
to dissolution was the King's only resource, but in the temper of
1678 the nation a new Parliament would have been yet more violent than
the present one; and Charles sullenly gave way. No measure has
ever brought about more startling results. The Duke of York
owned himself a Catholic, and resigned his office as Lord High
Admiral. Throngs of excited people gathered round the Lord
Treasurer's house at the news that Clifford, too, had owned to
being a Catholic and had laid down his staff of office. Their
resignation was followed by that of hundreds of others in the army
and the civil service of the Crown. On public opinion the effect was
wonderful. "I dare not write all the strange talk of the town,"
says Evelyn. The resignations were held to have proved the
existence of the dangers which the Test Act had been passed to
meet. From this moment all trust in Charles was at an end. "The
King," Shaftesbury said bitterly, "who if he had been so happy
as to have been born a private gentleman had certainly passed for
a man of good parts, excellent breeding, and well natured, hath
now, being a Prince, brought his affairs to that pass that there is
not a person in the world, man or woman, that dares rely upon
him or put any confidence in his word or friendship."

SECTION IV.—DANBY, 1673—1678

[*Authorities.*—As under the previous section, with the addition of
the "Memoirs of Sir John Reresby," and Danby's "Letters."]

haftes- The one man in England on whom the discovery of the King's
ury perfidy fell with the most crushing effect was the Chancellor, Lord
Shaftesbury. Throughout his life Ashley Cooper had piqued himself
on a penetration which read the characters of men around him, and
on a political instinct which discerned every coming change. His
self-reliance was wonderful. In mere boyhood he saved his estate
from the greed of his guardians by boldly appealing in person to
Noy, who was then Attorney-General. As an undergraduate at
Oxford he organized a rebellion of the freshmen against the oppres-
sive customs which were enforced by the senior men of his college,
and succeeded in abolishing them. At eighteen he was a member
of the Short Parliament. On the outbreak of the Civil War he took
part with the King; but in the midst of the Royal successes he
foresaw the ruin of the Royal cause, passed to the Parliament,
attached himself to the fortunes of Cromwell, and became member
of the Council of State. A temporary disgrace during the last years
of the Protectorate only quickened him to a restless hatred which
did much to bring about its fall. We have already seen his bitter
invectives against the dead Protector, his intrigues with Monk,
and the active part which he took, as member of the Council of
State, in the King's recall. Charles rewarded his services with a
peerage, and with promotion to a foremost share in the Royal

1673
to
1678

neils. Ashley was then a man of forty, and under the Commonwealth he had been famous, in Dryden's contemptuous phrase, as "the loudest bagpipe of the squeaking train"; but he was never a minister of Charles than he flung himself into the debauchery of the Court with an ardour which surprised even his ter. "You are the wickedest dog in England!" laughed Charles some unscrupulous jest of his councillor's. "Of a subject, Sir, lieve I am!" was the unabashed reply. But the debauchery of ley was simply a mask. He was, in fact, temperate by nature habit, and his ill-health rendered any great excess impossible.

soon found that the courtier who lounged in Lady Castle-ne's boudoir, or drank and jested with Sedley and Buckingham, a diligent and able man of business. "He is a man," says puzzled Popys, three years after the Restoration, "of great ness, and yet of pleasure and dissipation too." His rivals were envious of the ease and mastery with which he dealt with tions of finance, as of the "nimble wit" which won the favour e King. Even in later years his industry earned the grudging se of his enemies. Dryden owned that as Chancellor he was ift to despatch and easy of access," and wondered at the rest-activity which "refused his age the needful hours of rest." activity indeed was the more wonderful that his health was rly broken. An accident in early days left behind it an abiding kness, whose traces were seen in the furrows which seared his pale face, in the feebleness of his health, and the nervous or which shook his puny frame. The "pigmy body" seemed etted to decay" by the "fiery soul" within it. But pain and kness brought with them no sourness of spirit. Ashley was cked more unscrupulously than any statesman save Walpole; Burnet, who did not love him, owns that he was never bitter agry in speaking of his assailants. Even the wit with which he hed them was commonly good-humoured. "When will you e done preaching?" a bishop murmured testily, as Shaftesbury speaking in the House of Peers. "When I am a bishop, my l!" was the laughing reply.

as a statesman Ashley not only stood high among his con- oraries from his wonderful readiness and industry, but he d far above them in his scorn of personal profit. Even Dryden, e raking together every fault in the Chancellor, owns that his ls were clean. As a political leader his position was to modern odd enough. In religion he was at best a Deist, with some iful notions "that after death our souls lived in stars," and ife was that of a debauchee. But, Deist and debauchee as he he represented, as we have seen, the Presbyterian and Non-ormist party in the Royal Council. He was the steady and ment advocate of toleration, but his advocacy was based on ly political grounds. He saw that persecution would fail to z back the Dissenters to the Church, and that the effort to l them only left Protestants disunited and at the mercy of

Shaftes-
bury's
Policy

1673
to
1678

their enemies. But in the temper of England after the Restoration he saw no hope of obtaining toleration save from the policy of the King. Wit, debauchery, rapidity in the despatch of business, were all used as means to keep Charles firm in his plans of toleration, and to secure him as a friend in the struggle which Ashley carried on against the intolerance of Clarendon. Charles, as we have seen, had his own game to play and his own reasons for protecting Ashley during his vehement but fruitless struggle against the Test and Corporation Act, the Act of Uniformity, and the persecution of the dissidents. Fortune at last smiled on the unscrupulous ability with which he entangled Clarendon in the embarrassments of the Dutch war of 1664, and took advantage of the alienation of the Parliament to ensure his fall. Of the yet more unscrupulous bargain which followed we have already spoken. Ashley bought, as he believed, the Declaration of Indulgence, the release of the imprisoned Nonconformists, and freedom of worship for all dissidents, at the price of a consent to the second attack on Holland; and he was looked on by the public at large as the minister most responsible both for the measures he advised and the measures he had nothing to do with. But while facing the gathering storm of unpopularity Ashley learnt in a moment of drunken confidence the secret of the King's religion. He owed to a friend "his trouble at the black cloud which was gathering over England;" but, troubled as he was, he still believed himself strong enough to use Charles for his own purposes. His acceptance of the Chancellorship and of the Earldom of Shaftesbury, as well as his violent defence of the war on opening the Parliament, identified him yet more with the Royal policy. It was at this moment, if we credit a statement of doubtful authority in itself but which squares with the sudden change in his course, that he learnt from Arlington the secret of the Treaty of Dover. Whether this were so, or whether suspicion, as in the people at large, deepened into certainty, Shaftesbury saw he had been duped. To the bitterness of such a discovery was added the bitterness of having aided in schemes which he abhorred. His change of policy was rapid and complete. He suddenly pressed for the withdrawal of the Declaration of Indulgence. Alone among his fellow-ministers he supported the Test Act with extraordinary vehemence. His success in displacing James and Clifford, and in creating a barrier against any future Catholic projects, gave him hopes of revenging the deceit which had been practised on him by forcing his policy on the King. For the moment indeed Charles was helpless. He found himself, as he had told Lewis long before, alone in his realm. The Test Act had been passed unanimously by both Houses. Even the Nonconformists deserted him, and preferred persecution to the support of his plans. The dismissal of the Catholic officers made the employment of force, if he ever contemplated it, impossible, while the ill success of the Dutch war robbed him of all hope of aid from France. The firmness of the Prince of Orange had at last roused the stubborn

ty of his countrymen. The French conquests on land were ly won back, and at sea the fleet of the allies was still held in ck by the fine seamanship of De Ruyter. Nor was William less essional in diplomacy than in war. The House of Austria was at roused to action by the danger which threatened Europe, and union with the United Provinces laid the foundation of the nd Alliance. Shaftesbury resolved to put an end to the war; for this purpose he threw himself into hearty alliance with Country party in the Commons, and welcomed the Duke of ond and Prince Rupert, who were looked upon as "great iament men," back to the Royal Council. It was to Shaftes- y's influence that Charles attributed the dislike which the mons displayed to the war, and their refusal of a grant of olies for it until fresh religious securities were devised. It was is instigation that an address was presented by both Houses nst the plan of marrying James to a Catholic princess, Mary of lena. But the projects of Shaftesbury were suddenly interrupted an unexpected act of vigour on the part of the King. The es were no sooner prorogued in November than the Chancellor ordered to deliver up the Seals.

1673
to
1678

Nov.
1673

It is only laying down my gown and buckling on my sword," Shaftesbury is said to have replied to the Royal bidding; and, igh the words were innocent enough, for the sword was part of usual dress of a gentleman which he must necessarily resume n he laid aside the gown of the Chancellor, they were taken as eying a covert threat. He was still determined to force on the g a peace with the States. But he looked forward to the dangers e future with even greater anxiety than to those of the present. Duke of York, the successor to the throne, had owned himself a olic, and almost everyone agreed that securities for the national ion would be necessary in the case of his accession. But Shaftes- r saw, and it is his especial merit that he did see, that with a like James, convinced of his Divine Right and bigoted in his ious fervour, securities were valueless. From the first he rmined to force on Charles his brother's exclusion from the ne, and his resolve was justified by the Revolution which finally e work he proposed to do. Unhappily he was equally deter- ed to fight Charles with weapons as vile as his own. The result ifford's resignation, of James's acknowledgment of his con- ion, had been to destroy all belief in the honesty of public men. ic of distrust had begun. The fatal truth was whispered that les himself was a Catholic. In spite of the Test Act, it was ected that men Catholics in heart still held high office in the e, and we know that in Arlington's case the suspicion was just. Shaftesbury seized on this public alarm, stirred above all by a e of inability to meet the secret dangers which day after day disclosing, as the means of carrying out his plans. He began ing the panic by tales of a Papist rising in London, and of a ing Irish revolt with a French army to back it. He retired to

Charles
and
Shaftes-
bury

1673
to
1678

his house in the City to find security against a conspiracy which had been formed, he said, to cut his throat. Meanwhile he rapidly organized the Country party in the Parliament, and placed himself openly at its head. An address for the removal of ministers "popishly affected or otherwise obnoxious or dangerous" was presented on the reassembling of the Houses in 1674, and the refusal of supplies made a continuance of the war impossible. A

1674

bill was brought in to prevent all Catholics from approaching the Court, in other words for removing James from the King's Councils. A far more important bill was that of the Protestant Securities, which was pressed by Shaftesbury, Halifax, and Carlisle, the leaders of the new Opposition in the House of Lords, a bill which enacted that any prince of the blood should forfeit his right to the Crown on his marriage with a Catholic. The bill, which was the first sketch of the later Exclusion Bill, failed to pass, but its failure left the Houses excited and alarmed. Shaftesbury was busy intriguing in the City, corresponding with William of Orange, and pressing for a war with France which Charles could only avert by an appeal to Lewis, a subsidy from whom enabled him to prorogue the Parliament. But Charles saw that the time had come to give way. "Things have turned out ill," he said to Temple with a burst of unusual petulance, "but had I been well served I might have made a good business of it." His concessions however were as usual complete. He dismissed Buckingham and Arlington. He made peace with the Dutch. But Charles was never more formidable than in the moment of defeat, and he had already resolved on a new policy by which the efforts of Shaftesbury might be held at bay. Ever since the opening of his reign he had clung to a system of balance, had pitted Churchman against Nonconformist, and Ashley against Clarendon, partly to preserve his own independence, and partly with a view of winning some advantage to the Catholics from the political strife. The temper of the Commons had enabled Clarendon to baffle the King's attempts; and on his fall Charles felt strong enough to abandon the attempt to preserve a political balance, and had thrown himself on the support of Lewis and the Nonconformists in his new designs. But the new policy broke down like the old. The Nonconformists refused to betray the cause of Protestantism, and Shaftesbury, their leader, was pressing on measures which would rob Catholicism of the hopes it had gained from the conversion of James. In straits like these Charles resolved to win back the Commons by boldly adopting the policy on which the House was set. The majority of its members were still a mass of Cavalier Churchmen, who regarded Sir Thomas Osborne, a dependant of Arlington's, as their representative in the Royal Councils. The King had already created Osborne Earl of Danby, and raised him to the post of Lord Treasurer in Clifford's room. In 1674 he frankly adopted the policy of his party in the Parliament.

Danby

The policy of Danby was simply that of Clarendon. He had all Clarendon's love of the Church, his equal hatred of Popery and

ment, his high notions of the prerogative tempered by a faith in
 ament and the law. The union between the Church and the
 n was ratified in a conference between Danby and the bishops
 ambeth; and its first fruits were seen in the rigorous enforce-
 of the law against conventicles, and the exclusion of all
 olics from Court. The Lady Mary, the eldest child of James,
 confirmed by the King's orders as a Protestant, while the
 ament which was assembled in 1675 was assured that the Test
 should be rigorously enforced. The change in the Royal policy
 not a moment too soon. As it was, the aid of the Cavalier
 which rallied round Danby hardly saved the King from the
 liation of being forced to recall the troops he still maintained
 e French service. To gain a majority on this point Danby was
 d to avail himself of a resource which from this time played
 early a hundred years an important part in English politics.
 ribed lavishly. He was more successful in winning back the
 rity of the Commons from their alliance with the Country
 by reviving the old spirit of religious persecution. He
 sed that the test which had been imposed by Clarendon on
 cipal officers should be extended to all functionaries of the
 ; that every member of either House, every magistrate and
 c officer, should swear never to take arms against the King
 "endeavour any alteration of the Protestant religion now
 lished by law in the Church of England, or any alteration in
 ivernment in Church and State as it is by law established."
 Bill was forced through the Lords by the bishops and the
 lier party, and its passage through the Commons was only
 ed by a quarrel on privilege between the two Houses which
 esbury dexterously fanned into flame. On the other hand the
 try party remained strong enough to refuse supplies. Eager
 ey were for the war with France which Danby promised, the
 nons could not trust the King; and Danby was soon to dis-
 how wise their distrust had been. For the Houses were no
 r prorogued than Charles revealed to him the negotiations he
 een all the while carrying on with Lewis, and required him
 gn a treaty by which, on consideration of a yearly pension
 nteed on the part of France, the two sovereigns bound them-
 s to enter into no engagements with other powers, and to lend
 other aid in case of rebellion in their dominions. Such a treaty
 nly bound England to dependence on France, but freed the
 from all Parliamentary control. But his minister pleaded in
 for delay and for the advice of the Council. Charles answered
 treaties by signing the treaty with his own hand. Danby
 l himself duped by the King as Shaftesbury had found him-
 uped; but his bold temper was only spurred to fresh plans
 ecuting the King from his bondage to Lewis. To do this the
 tep was to reconcile the King and the Parliament, which met
 76 after a prorogation of fifteen months. The Country party
 in the way of such a reconciliation, but Danby resolved to

1673
to
1678

1675

1676

1673
to
1678

break its strength by measures of unscrupulous vigour, for which a blunder of Shaftesbury's gave an opportunity. Shaftesbury despaired of bringing the House of Commons, elected as it had been fifteen years before in a moment of religious and political reaction, to any steady opposition to the Crown. He had already moved an address for a dissolution; and he now urged that as a statute of Edward the Third ordained that Parliaments should be held "once a year or oftener if need be," the Parliament by the recent prorogation of a year and a half had ceased legally to exist. The Triennial Act deprived such an argument of any force. But Danby represented it as a contempt of the House, and the Lords at his bidding committed its supporters, Shaftesbury, Buckingham, Salisbury, and Wharton, to the Tower in 1677. While the Opposition cowered under the blow, Danby pushed on a measure which was designed to win back alarmed Churchmen to confidence in the Crown. By the bill for the Security of the Church it was provided that on the succession of a king not a member of the Established Church the appointment of bishops should be vested in the existing prelates, and that the King's children should be placed in the guardianship of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

1677

reaty
of Nime-
uen

The bill however failed in the Commons; and a grant of supply was only obtained by Danby's profuse bribery. The progress of the war abroad, indeed, was rousing panic in England faster than Danby could allay it. The successes of the French arms in Flanders, and a defeat of the Prince of Orange at Cassel stirred the whole country to a cry for war. The House of Commons echoed the cry in an address to the Crown; but Charles parried the blow by demanding a supply before the war was declared, and on the refusal of the still suspicious House prorogued the Parliament. Fresh and larger subsidies from France enabled him to continue this prorogation for seven months. But the silence of the Parliament did little to silence the country; and Danby took advantage of the popular cry for war to press an energetic course of action on the King. In its will to check French aggression the Cavalier party was as earnest as the Puritan, and Danby aimed at redeeming his failure at home by uniting the Parliament through a vigorous policy abroad. As usual, Charles gave way. He was himself for the moment uneasy at the appearance of the French on the Flemish coast, and he owned that "he could never live at ease with his subjects" if Flanders were abandoned. He allowed Danby, therefore, to press on both parties the necessity for mutual concessions, and to define the new attitude of England by a step which was to produce results far more momentous than any of which either Charles or his minister dreamed. The Prince of Orange was suddenly invited to England, and wedded to Mary, the eldest child of the Duke of York. As the King was childless, and James had no son, Mary was presumptive heiress of the Crown. The marriage therefore promised a close political union in the future with Holland, and a corresponding opposition to the ambition of France. With the country it was

ular as a Protestant match, and as ensuring a Protestant
 successor to James. Lewis was bitterly angered; he rejected the
 English propositions of peace, and again set his army in the field.
 Danby was ready to accept the challenge, and the withdrawal of
 the English ambassador from Paris was followed in 1678 by an
 assembly of the Parliament. A warlike speech from the throne was
 answered by a warlike address from the House, supplies were voted,
 an army raised. But the actual declaration of war still failed to
 appear. While Danby threatened war, Charles was busy turning
 threat to his own profit, and gaining time by prorogations for
 delays of base negotiations. At one stage he demanded from
 the allies a fresh pension for the next three years as the price of his
 offices with the allies. Danby stooped to write the demand,
 Charles added, "This letter is written by my order, C.R."
 Three thousand English soldiers were landed at Ostend;
 the allies were already broken by their suspicions of the King's
 policy, and Charles soon agreed for a fresh pension to recall
 his brigade. The bargain was hardly struck when Lewis withdrew
 terms of peace he had himself offered, and on the faith of which
 he had ostensibly retired from the scene. Danby at once
 asked fresh aid to the allies, but all faith in England was lost. One
 year after another gave way to the new French demands, and
 the virtual victory of Lewis was secured in July, 1678, by the
 signing of the Treaty of Nimeguen.

1673
 to
 1678

1678

The Treaty of Nimeguen not only left France the arbiter of
 Europe, but it left Charles the master of a force of twenty thousand
 men levied for the war he refused to declare, and with nearly a
 million of French money in his pocket. His course had roused into
 life the old suspicions of his perfidy, and of a secret plot with
 France for the ruin of English freedom and of English religion. That
 there was such a plot we know; and the hopes of the Catholic party
 mounted as fast as the panic of the Protestants. Coleman, the
 favourite of the Duchess of York, and a busy intriguer, had gained
 sufficient knowledge of the real plans of the King and of his brother
 to induce him to beg for money from Lewis in the work of further-
 ing them by intrigues in the Parliament. A passage from his letter
 gives us a glimpse of the wild hopes which were stirring among
 the hotter Catholics of the time. "They had a mighty work on
 their hands," he wrote, "no less than the conversion of three
 kingdoms, and by that perhaps the utter subduing of a pestilent
 empire which had so long domineered over a great part of the
 known world. Success would give the greatest blow to the
 Protestant religion that it had received since its birth." The letter
 was secret; but the hopes of the Catholics were known, and the
 danger grew fast. Meanwhile one of the vile impostors who are
 always thrown to the surface at times of great public agitation was
 ready to take advantage of the general alarm by the invention of a
 Popish plot. Titus Oates, a Baptist minister before the Restoration,
 courtier and navy chaplain after it, but left penniless by his

The
 Popish
 Plot

infamous character, had sought bread in a conversion to Catholicism, and had been received into Jesuit houses at Valladolid and St. Omer. While he remained there, he learnt the fact of a secret meeting of the Jesuits in London, which was probably nothing but the usual congregation of the order. On his expulsion for misconduct this single fact widened in his fertile brain into a plot for the subversion of Protestantism and the death of the King. His story was laid before Charles, and received with cool incredulity; but Oates made affidavit of its truth before a London magistrate, Sir Edmondsbury Godfrey, and at last managed to appear before the Council. He declared that he had been trusted with letters which disclosed the Jesuit plans. They were stirring rebellion in Ireland; in Scotland they disguised themselves as Cameronians; in England their aim was to assassinate the King, and to leave the throne open to the Papist Duke of York. But no letters appeared to support these monstrous charges, and Oates would have been dismissed with contempt but for the seizure of Coleman's correspondence. His letters gave a new colour to the plot. Danby himself, conscious of the truth that there were designs which Charles dared not avow, was shaken in his rejection of the disclosures, and inclined to use them as weapons to check the King in his Catholic policy. But a more unscrupulous hand had already seized on the growing panic. Shaftesbury, released after a long imprisonment and desperate of other courses, threw himself into the plot. "Let the Treasurer cry as loud as he pleases against Popery," he laughed, "I will cry a note louder." But no cry was needed to heighten the popular frenzy from the moment when Sir Edmondsbury Godfrey, a magistrate before whom Oates had laid his information, was found in a field near London with his sword run through his heart. His death was assumed to be murder, and the murder to be an attempt of the Jesuits to "stifle the plot." A solemn funeral added to public agitation; and the two Houses named committees to investigate the charges made by Oates.

In this investigation Shaftesbury took the lead. Whatever his personal ambition may have been, his public aims in all that followed were wise and far-sighted. He aimed at forcing Charles to dissolve the Parliament and appeal again to the nation. He aimed at forcing on Charles a ministry which should break his dependence on France and give a constitutional turn to his policy. He saw that no guaranty would really avail to meet the danger of a Catholic sovereign, and he aimed at excluding James from the throne. But in pursuing these aims he rested wholly on the plot. He fanned the popular panic by accepting without question some fresh depositions in which Oates charged five Catholic peers with part in the Jesuit conspiracy. The peers were sent to the Tower, and two thousand suspected persons were hurried to prison. A proclamation ordered every Catholic to leave London. The trainbands were called to arms, and patrols paraded through the streets, to guard against the Catholic rising which Oates declared to be at

1678
to
1678

1. Meanwhile Shaftesbury turned the panic to political account forcing through Parliament against the fierce opposition of the t party a bill which excluded Catholics from a seat in either se. The exclusion remained in force for a century and a half; it had really been aimed against the Duke of York, and Shaftesbury was defeated by a proviso which exempted James from the action of the bill. The plot too which had been supported for months by the sole evidence of Oates, began to hang fire; but promise of reward brought forward a villain, named Bedloe, with beside which those of Oates seemed tame. The two informers now pressed forward by an infamous rivalry to stranger and rger revelations. Bedloe swore to the existence of a plot for landing of a Papist army and a general massacre of the Prots. Oates capped the revelations of Bedloe by charging the n herself, at the bar of the Lords, with knowledge of the plot murder her husband. Monstrous as such charges were, they ved the waning frenzy of the people and of the two Houses. peers under arrest were ordered to be impeached. A new lamation enjoined the arrest of every Catholic in the realm. ries of judicial murders began with the trial and execution of man, which even now can only be remembered with horror. the alarm must soon have worn out had it only been supported erjury. What gave force to the false plot was the existence of o one. Coleman's letters had won credit for the perjuries of s, and a fresh discovery now won credit for the perjuries of oe. The English ambassador at Paris, Edward Montagu, ned home on a quarrel with Danby, obtained a seat in the se of Commons, and in spite of the seizure of his papers laid ie table of the House the despatch which had been forwarded ewis, demanding payment of the King's services to France ig the late negotiations. The House was thunderstruck; for, ig as had been the general suspicion, the fact of the dependence ngland on a foreign power had never before been proved. oy's name was signed to the despatch, and he was at once ached on a charge of high treason. But Shaftesbury was more to secure the election of a new Parliament than to punish his , and Charles was resolved to prevent at any price a trial which l not fail to reveal the disgraceful secret of his foreign policy. les was in fact at Shaftesbury's mercy, and the bargain for h Shaftesbury had been playing had to be struck. The Earl d that the impeachment should be dropped, and the King ised that a new Parliament should be summoned, and a new try called into office.

1679
to
1682

SECTION V.—SHAFTESBURY, 1679—1682

[*Authorities.*—As before, with the addition of Russell's "Life of William Lord Russell," Foxcroft, "Life of Halifax," and Pollock, "The Popish Plot."]

Sir
William
Temple

When the Parliament met in March, 1679, the King's pledge was redeemed by the dismissal of Danby from his post of Treasurer, and the constitution of a new ministry. Shaftesbury, as its most important member, became President of the Council. The chiefs of the Country party, Lord Russell and Lord Cavendish, took their seats at the board with Lords Holles and Roberts, the older representatives of the Presbyterian party which had merged in the general Opposition. Savile, Lord Halifax, as yet known only as a keen and ingenious speaker, entered the ministry in the train of his own connection, Lord Shaftesbury, while Lord Essex and Lord Capel, two of the most popular among the Country leaders, went to the Treasury. The recall of Sir William Temple, the negotiator of the Triple Alliance, from his embassy at the Hague to fill the post of Secretary of State, promised a foreign policy which would again place England high among the European powers. Temple returned with a plan of administration which, fruitless as it directly proved, is of great importance as marking the silent change which was passing over the Constitution. Like many men of his time, he was equally alarmed at the power both of the Crown and of the Parliament. In moments of national excitement the power of the Houses seemed irresistible. They had overthrown Clarendon. They had overthrown Clifford and the Cabal. They had just overthrown Danby. But though they were strong enough in the end to punish ill government, they showed no power of securing good government or of permanently influencing the policy of the Crown. For nineteen years, in fact, with a Parliament always sitting, Charles had had it all his own way. He had made war against the will of the nation, and he had refused to make war when the nation demanded it. While every Englishman hated France, he had made England a mere dependency of the French King. The remedy for this state of things, as it was afterwards found, was a very simple one. By a change which we shall have to trace, the Ministry has now become a Committee of State-officers, named by the majority of the House of Commons from amongst the more prominent of its representatives in either House, whose object in accepting office is to do the will of that majority. So long as the majority of the House of Commons itself represents the more powerful current of public opinion it is clear that such an arrangement makes government an accurate reflection of the national will. But obvious as such a plan may seem to us, it had as yet occurred to no English statesman. Even to Temple the one remedy seemed to lie in the restoration of the Royal Council to its older powers. This body, composed as it was of the great officers of the Court, the Royal

surer and Secretaries, and a few nobles specially summoned by the sovereign, formed up to the close of Elizabeth's reign a sort of deliberative assembly to which the graver matters of public administration were commonly submitted by the Crown. The practice, however, of previously submitting such measures to a larger body of the more important councillors must always have existed; and under James this secret committee, which was then known as the Cabala or Cabal, began almost wholly to supersede the Council itself. In the large and balanced Council which was established after the Restoration all real power rested with the "cabala" of Clarendon, Southampton, Ormond, Monk, and the Secretaries; and on Clarendon's fall these were succeeded by Lord Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley, and Lauderdale. By a coincidence the initials of the latter names formed the word "cabal," which has ever since retained the sinister meaning their popularity gave to it. The effect of these smaller committees undoubtedly been to remove the check which the larger peers and the more popular composition of the Royal Council upon the Crown. The unscrupulous projects which made the fall of Clifford and his fellows a by-word among Englishmen could never have been laid before a Council of great peers and literary officers of State. To Temple therefore the organization of a Council seemed to furnish a check on mere personal government which Parliament was unable to supply. For this purpose the "cabala," or Cabinet, as it was now becoming the fashion to term the confidential committee of the Council, was abolished. The Council itself was restricted to thirty members, and their joint revenue was not to fall below £300,000, a sum little less than what was estimated as the income of the whole House of Commons. A council of great nobles and proprietors, not too numerous for secret deliberation, and wealthy enough to counterbalance either the nobles or the Crown, would form, Temple hoped, a barrier against the violence and aggression of the one power, and a check upon mere despotism of the other.

The new Council and the new ministry gave fair hope of a wise and patriotic government. But the difficulties were still great. The nation was frenzied with suspicion and panic. The elections to the Parliament had taken place amidst a whirl of excitement which left no place for candidates of the Court; and so unmanageable was the temper of the Commons that Shaftesbury was unable to carry out his part of the bargain with Charles. The Commons insisted on carrying the impeachment of Danby to the House of Lords. The appointment of the new ministry, indeed, was welcomed with a burst of general joy; but the disbanding of the army and the withdrawal of the Duke of York to Holland at James's command failed to restore public confidence. At the bottom of the panic lay the dread of a Catholic successor to the throne, a dread which the after history of James fully justified. Shaftesbury was earnest for the exclusion of James, but as yet the

The Ex-
clusion

1679
to
1682

majority of the Council shrank from the step, and supported a plan which Charles brought forward for restraining the powers of his successor. By this project the presentation to Church livings was to be taken out of the new monarch's hands. The last Parliament of the preceding reign was to continue to sit; and the appointment of all Councillors, Judges, Lord-Lieutenants, and officers in the fleet, was vested in the two Houses so long as a Catholic sovereign was on the throne. The extent of these provisions showed the pressure which Charles felt, but Shaftesbury was undoubtedly right in setting the plan aside as at once insufficient and impracticable. He continued to advocate the Exclusion in the Royal Council; and a bill for depriving James of his right to the Crown, and for devolving it on the next Protestant in the line of succession was introduced into the Commons by his adherents and passed the House by a large majority. It was known that Charles would use his influence with the Peers for its rejection. The Earl therefore fell back on the tactics of Pym. A bold Remonstrance was prepared in the Commons. The City of London was ready with an address to the two Houses in favour of the bill. All Charles could do was to gain time by the prorogation of the Parliament for a few months.

Mon-
mouth

But delay would have been useless had the Country party remained at one. The temper of the nation and of the House of Commons was so hotly pronounced in favour of the Exclusion of the Duke that union among the patriot ministers must in the end have secured it and spared England the necessity for the Revolution of 1688. The wiser leaders among them, indeed, were already leaning to the very change which that Revolution brought about. If James were passed over, his daughter Mary, the wife of the Prince of Orange, stood next in the order of succession; and the plan of Temple, Essex, and Halifax was to bring the Prince over to England during the prorogation, to introduce him into the Council, and to pave his way to the throne. Unhappily Shaftesbury was contemplating a very different course. For reasons which still remain obscure, he distrusted the Prince of Orange. His desire for a more radical change may have been prompted by the maxim ascribed to him that "a bad title makes a good king." But whatever were his motives, he had resolved to set aside the claim of both James and his children, and to place the Duke of Monmouth on the throne. Monmouth was the eldest of the King's bastards, a weak and worthless profligate in temper, but popular through his personal beauty and his reputation for bravery. He had just returned in triumph from suppressing a revolt which had broken out among the Scotch Covenanters in the western shires; and the tale was at once set about of a secret marriage between the King and his mother which would have made him lawful heir to the throne. Shaftesbury almost openly espoused his cause. He pressed the King to give him the command of the Guards, which would have put the only military force in Monmouth's hands. Left all

in this course by the opposition of his colleagues, the Earl & himself more and more on the support of the Plot. The execution of its victims was pushed recklessly on. Three Catholics hanged in London. Eight priests were put to death in the try. Pursuivants and informers spread terror through every sh household. Shaftesbury counted on the reassembling of the ament to bring all this terror to bear upon the King. But les had already seized on the breach which the Earl's policy made in the ranks of the Country party. He saw that Shaftesbury was unsupported by any of his colleagues save Russell. To ole, Essex, or Halifax it seemed possible to bring about the ssion of Mary without any violent revolution; but to set , not only the right of James, but the right of his Protestant ren, was to ensure a civil war. The influence, however, of esbury over the Commons promised a speedy recognition of outh, and Temple could only meet this by advising Charles ssolve the Parliament.

Shaftesbury's anger vented itself in threats that the advisers of dissolution should pay for it with their heads. The danger was ght home to them by a sudden illness of the King; and the ect of ruin if Monmouth should succeed in his design drew the rate party in the Council, whether they would or no, to the of York. It was the alarm which Essex and Halifax felt at the ts of Shaftesbury which made them advise the recall of James e King's illness; and though the Duke again withdrew to ough on his brother's recovery, the same ministers encouraged es to send Monmouth out of the country and to dismiss esbury himself from the Council. The dismissal was the signal struggle to whose danger Charles was far from blinding him- What had saved him till now was his cynical courage. In the of the terror and panic of the Plot men "wondered to see uite cheerful amidst such an intricacy of troubles," says the y Reresby, "but it was not in his nature to think or perplex lf much about anything." Even in the heat of the tumult followed on Shaftesbury's dismissal, Charles was seen fishing auntering as usual in Windsor Park. But closer observers Reresby saw beneath this veil of indolent unconcern a con- ness of new danger. "From this time," says Burnet, "his r was observed to change very visibly." He became in fact en and thoughtful; he saw that he had to do with a strange f people, that could neither be managed nor frightened." But ed the danger with his old unscrupulous coolness. He red secret negotiations with France. Lewis was as alarmed as s himself at the warlike temper of the nation, and as anxious vent the assembly of a Parliament; but the terms on which ered a subsidy were too humiliating even for the King's ance. The failure forced him to summon a new Parliament: e terror, which Shaftesbury was busily feeding with new tales ssacre and invasion, returned members even more violent

1679
to
1682

Shaftes-
bury's
Dis-
missal

1679
to
1682

than the members of the House he had just dismissed. Even the Council shrank from the King's proposal to prorogue this Parliament at its first meeting in 1680, but Charles persisted. Alone as he stood, he was firm in his resolve to gain time, for Time, as he saw, was working in his favour. The tide of public sympathy was beginning to turn. The perjury of Oates proved too much at last for the credulity of juries; and the acquittal of four of his victims was a sign that the panic was beginning to ebb. A far stronger proof of this was seen in the immense efforts which Shaftesbury made to maintain it. Fresh informers were brought forward to swear a plot for the assassination of the Earl himself, and to the share of the Duke of York in the conspiracies of his fellow Papists. A paper found in a meal-tub was produced as evidence of the new danger. Gigantic torch-light processions paraded the streets of London, and the effigy of the Pope was burnt amidst the wild outcry of a vast multitude.

Peti-
tioners
and Ab-
horrrers

Acts of yet greater daring showed the lengths to which Shaftesbury was now ready to go. He had grown up amidst the tumults of civil war, and, greyheaded as he was, the fire and vehemence of his early days seemed to wake again in the singular recklessness with which he drove on the nation to a new struggle in arms. In 1680 he formed a committee for promoting agitation throughout the country; and the petitions which it drew up for the assembly of the Parliament were sent to every town and grand jury, and sent back again with thousands of signatures. Monmouth, in spite of the King's orders, returned at Shaftesbury's call to London; and a daring pamphlet pointed him out as the nation's leader in the coming struggle against Popery and tyranny. So great was the alarm of the Council that the garrison in every fortress was held in readiness for instant war. But the danger was really over. The tide of opinion had fairly turned. Acquittal followed acquittal. A reaction of horror and remorse at the cruelty which had hurried victim after victim to the gallows succeeded to the pitiless frenzy which Shaftesbury had fanned into a flame. Anxious as the nation was for a Protestant sovereign, its sense of justice revolted against the wrong threatened to James' Protestant children; and every gentleman in the realm felt insulted at the project of setting Mary aside to put the crown of England on the head of a Royal bastard. The memory too of the Civil War was still fresh and keen, and the rumour of an outbreak of revolt rallied every loyalist round the King. The host of petitions which Shaftesbury procured from the counties was answered by a counter host of addresses from thousands who declared their "abhorrence" of the plans against the Crown. The country was divided into two great factions of "petitioners" and "abhorrrers," the germs of the two great parties of "Whigs" and "Tories" which have played so prominent a part in our political history from the time of the Exclusion Bill. Charles at once took advantage of this turn of affairs. He recalled the Duke of York to the Court. He received the resignations of Russell and

andish, who alone in the Council still supported Shaftesbury's acts, "with all his heart." Shaftesbury met defiance with defiance. Followed by a crowd of his adherents he attended before the Grand Jury of Middlesex, to present the Duke of York as a seditious recusant, and the King's mistress, the Duchess of Portsmouth, as a national nuisance, while Monmouth returned to make progress through the country, and won favour everywhere by his winning demeanour. Above all, Shaftesbury relied on the temper of the Commons, elected as they had been in the very heat of the election and irritated by the long prorogation; and the first act of the House on meeting in October was to vote that their care should be to suppress Popery and prevent a Popish successor." Rumours

1679
to
1682

A Catholic plot in Ireland was hardly needed to push the Union Bill through the Commons without a division; and even the Council wavered before the resolute temper of their opponents. Northampton and Essex both declared themselves in favour of the Union. Of all the leaders of the Country party, only Lord Halifax now remained opposed to it, and his opposition simply consisted in securing its object by less violent means. "My Lord Halifax is entirely in the interest of the Prince of Orange," the French ambassador, Barillon, wrote to his master, "and what he is to be doing for the Duke of York is really in order to make opening for a compromise by which the Prince of Orange may fit." But Charles eagerly seized on this fatal disunion in the party which could effectively check his designs. He dismissed Northampton and Temple and backed by his personal influence the influence of Halifax in bringing about the rejection of the Exclusion Bill in the Lords. The same fate awaited Shaftesbury's daring efforts to pass a Bill of Divorce, which would have led Charles to put away his queen on the ground of barrenness, by a fresh marriage to give a Protestant heir to the throne.

October,
1680

As old as the King's action had been, it rested for support simply on the change in public feeling, and this Shaftesbury resolved to turn and turn by a great public impeachment which would revive and establish the general belief in the Plot. Lord Stafford, who was of his age and rank was looked on as the leader of the Catholic party, had lain a prisoner in the Tower since the first outburst of popular frenzy. He was now solemnly impeached; and his trial in November 1680 mustered the whole force of informers to prove the existence of a Catholic conspiracy against the King and the realm. The impeachment was worthless; but the trial revived, as Shaftesbury had hoped, much of the old panic, and the condemnation of the prisoner by a majority of his peers was followed by his death on the scaffold. The blow produced its effect on all but Charles. Even Lord Halifax, the ablest of the new ministers who had succeeded Northampton and his friends, pressed the King to give way. Halifax, still firm against the Exclusion Bill, took advantage of the popular pressure to introduce a measure which would with less risk of violence have as completely accomplished the ends of an

The
Oxford
Parliament

exclusion as the bill itself, a measure which would have taken from James on his accession the right of veto on any bill passed by the two Houses, the right of negotiating with foreign states, or of appointing either civil or military officers save with the consent of Parliament. The plan was no doubt prompted by the Prince of Orange; and the States of Holland supported it by pressing Charles to come to an accommodation with his subjects which would enable them to check the perpetual aggressions which France had been making on her neighbours since the Peace of Nimeguen. But deserted as he was by his ministers, and even by his mistress, for the Duchess of Portsmouth had been cowed into supporting the exclusion by the threats of Shaftesbury, Charles was determined to resist every project whether of exclusion or limitation. On a refusal of supplies he dissolved the Parliament. The truth was that he had at last succeeded in procuring the aid of France. Without the knowledge of his ministers he had renewed his secret negotiations, had pledged himself to withdraw from alliance with all the opponents of French policy, and in return had been promised a subsidy which recruited his Treasury and again rendered him independent of Parliaments. With characteristic subtilty however he summoned, in March 1681, a new Parliament. The summons was a mere blind. The King's one aim was to frighten the country into reaction by the dread of civil strife; and his summons of the Parliament to Oxford was an appeal to the country against the disloyalty of the capital, and an adroit means of reviving the memories of the Civil War. With the same end he ordered his guards to accompany him, on the pretext of anticipated disorder; and Shaftesbury, himself terrified at the projects of the Court, aided the King's designs by appearing with his followers in arms on the plea of self-protection. The violence of the Parliament played yet more effectually into the King's hands. Its members were the same as those who had been returned to the Parliament he had just dissolved, and their temper was more vehement than ever. Their rejection of a new Limitation Bill brought forward by Halifax, which while conceding to James the title of King would have vested the actual functions of government in the Prince of Orange, alienated the more moderate and sensible of the Country party. Their attempt to revive the panic by impeaching an informer, FitzHarris, before the House of Lords in defiance of the constitutional rule which entitled him as a commoner to a trial by his peers in the course of common law, did still more to throw public opinion on the side of the Crown. Shaftesbury's course rested wholly on the belief that the penury of the Treasury left Charles at his mercy, and that a refusal of supplies must wring from the King his assent to the exclusion. But the gold of France had freed the King from his thralldom. He had used the Parliament simply to exhibit himself as a sovereign whose patience and conciliatory temper was rewarded with insult and violence; and now that he saw his end accomplished, he suddenly dissolved the Houses in April, and

pealed in a Royal declaration to the justice of the nation at
ge.

1679

to

1682

—
Shaftes-
bury's
Death

The appeal was met by an almost universal burst of loyalty. The
urch rallied to the King; his declaration was read from every
pit; and the Universities solemnly decided that "no religion,
law, no fault, no forfeiture," could avail to bar the sacred right
hereditary succession. The arrest of Shaftesbury on a charge of
orning false witnesses to the Plot marked the new strength of
Crown. London indeed was still true to him; the Middlesex
and Jury ignored the bill of his indictment; and his discharge
m the Tower was welcomed in every street with bonfires and
ging of bells. But a fresh impulse was given to the loyal enthu-
sm of the country at large by the publication of a plan found
ong his papers, the plan of a secret association for the furtherance
the exclusion, whose members bound themselves to obey the
ers of Parliament even after its prorogation or dissolution by

Crown. Charles pushed boldly on in his new course. He con-
ned the loyalty of the Church by renewing the persecution of the
nconformists. The Duke of York returned in triumph to St.
nes's, and the turn of the tide was so manifest that Lord
derland and the ministers, who had wavered till now, openly
ght the Duke's favour. Monmouth, who had resumed his
grosses through the country as a means of checking the tide of
ction, was at once arrested. A daring breach of custom placed
ies in 1682 as sheriffs of the City of London, and the packed
es they nominated left the life of every exclusionist at the mercy
the Crown. Shaftesbury, alive to the new danger, plunged
perately into conspiracies with a handful of adventurers as
perate as himself, hid himself in the City, where he boasted that
thousand "brisk boys" were ready to appear at his call, and
ed his friends to rise in arms. But their delays drove him to
ht; and in January 1683, two months after his arrival in
land, the soul of the great leader, great from his immense
rgy and the wonderful versatility of his genius, but whose genius
energy had ended in wrecking for the time the fortunes of
lish freedom and in associating the noblest of causes with the
st of crimes, found its first quiet in death.

1682

[*Authorities.*—For the closing years of Charles II. and the reign of James II., in addition to Burnet, may be mentioned Dalrymple's "Memoirs," especially valuable for the appendices in the third volume; Bramston's "Autobiography"; the "Diary of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon," and the "Diary of Thomas Cartwright." Clarke's "Life of James II" contains the king's autobiographical remains. Lutterell's "Brief Historical Relation of State Affairs" is valuable for London. The Ellis Correspondence and the Clarendon Correspondence are useful for James II. Wellwood, "Memoirs," is valuable for the Revolution from a Whig standpoint. Macaulay's "History" is the most famous modern account; Lingard and Ranke must also be consulted.]

The
Royal
Triumph

1683

The flight of Shaftesbury proclaimed the triumph of the King. His wonderful sagacity had told him when the struggle was over and further resistance useless. But the Whig leaders, who had delayed to answer the Earl's call, still nursed projects of rising in arms; and the more desperate spirits who had clustered round him as he lay hidden to the City took refuge in plots of assassination and in a plan for murdering Charles and his brother as they passed the Rye-house on their road from London to Newmarket. Both the conspiracies were betrayed, and though they were wholly distinct from one another the cruel ingenuity of the Crown lawyers blended them into one. Lord Essex, the last of an ill-fated race, saved himself from a traitor's death by suicide in the Tower. Lord Russell, convicted on a charge of sharing in the Rye-house plot, was beheaded in Lincoln Inn Fields. The same fate awaited Algernon Sidney. Monmouth fled in terror over sea, and his flight was followed by a series of prosecutions for sedition directed against his followers. In 1683 the Constitutional opposition which had held Charles so long in check lay crushed at his feet. A weaker man might easily have been led into a wild tyranny by the mad outburst of loyalty which greeted his triumph. On the very day when the crowd around Russell's scaffold were dipping their handkerchiefs in his blood, as in the blood of a martyr, the University of Oxford solemnly declared that the doctrine of passive obedience, even to the worst of rulers, was a part of religion. But Charles saw that immense obstacles still lay in the road of a mere tyranny. The Church was as powerful as ever, and the mention of a renewal of the Indulgence to Nonconformists had to be withdrawn before the opposition of the bishops. He was careful therefore during the few years which remained to him to avoid the appearance of any open violation of public law. He suspended no statute. He imposed no tax by Royal authority. He generally enforced the Test Act. Nothing indeed shows more completely how great a work the Long Parliament had done than a survey of the reign of Charles the Second. "The King," Hallam says very truly, "was restored to nothing but what the law had preserved to him." No attempt was made to restore the abuses which the patriots of 1641 had swept

ray. Parliament was continually summoned. In spite of its frequent refusal of supplies, no attempt was ever made to raise money by unconstitutional means. The few illegal proclamations issued under Clarendon ceased with his fall. No effort was made to revive the Star Chamber and the Court of High Commission; and if judges were servile and juries sometimes packed, there was no open interference with the course of justice. In two remarkable points freedom had made an advance even on 1641. From the moment when printing began to tell on public opinion, it had been regulated by a system of licences. The regulations framed under Henry the Eighth subjected the press to the control of the Star Chamber, and the Martin Marprelate libels brought about a yet more stringent control under Elizabeth. Even the Long Parliament laid a heavy hand on the press, and the great remonstrance of Milton in his "Areopagitica" fell dead on the ears of his Puritan associates. But the statute for the regulation of printing which was passed immediately after the Restoration expired finally in 1679, and the temper of the Parliament gave no hope of any successful attempt to re-establish the censorship. To the freedom of the press the Habeas Corpus Act added a new security for the personal freedom of every Englishman. Against arbitrary imprisonment provision had been made in the earliest ages by a famous clause in the Great Charter. No free man could be held in prison save on charge or conviction of crime or for debt; and every prisoner on a criminal charge could demand as a right from the court of King's Bench the issue of a writ of "habeas corpus," which bound his officer to produce both the prisoner and the warrant on which he was imprisoned, that the court might judge whether he was imprisoned according to law. In cases however of imprisonment by a warrant of the Royal Council it had been sometimes held by judges that the writ could not be issued, and under Clarendon's administration instances had in this way occurred of imprisonment without legal remedy. But his fall was quickly followed by the introduction of a bill to secure this right of the subject, and after a long struggle the Act which is known as the Habeas Corpus Act passed finally in 1679. By this great statute the old practice of the writ was freed from all difficulties and exceptions. Every prisoner committed for any crime save treason or felony was declared entitled to his writ even in the vacations of the courts, and heavy penalties were enforced on judges or gaolers who refused him this right. Every person committed for felony or treason was entitled to be released on bail, unless indicted at the next session of gaol delivery after his commitment, and to be discharged if not indicted at the sessions which followed. It was forbidden under the heaviest penalties to send a prisoner into any places or fortresses beyond seas.

Falling to the Crown as the freedom of the press and the Habeas Corpus Act were soon found to be, Charles made no attempt to curtail the one or to infringe the other. But while cautious to avoid

1682
to
1688

Death of
Charles

1682
to
1688

rousing popular resistance, he moved coolly and resolutely forward on the path of despotism. It was in vain that Halifax pressed for energetic resistance to the aggressions of France, for the recall of Monmouth, or for the calling of a fresh Parliament. Like every other English statesman he found he had been duped, and that now his work was done he was suffered to remain in office but left without any influence in the government. In spite of his remonstrances the Test Act was violated by the readmission of James to a seat in the Council, and by his restoration to the office of Lord High Admiral. Parliament, in defiance of the Triennial Act, remained unassembled during the remainder of the King's reign. His secret alliance with France furnished Charles with the funds he immediately required, and the rapid growth of the customs through the increase of English commerce promised to give him a revenue which, if peace were preserved, would save him from the need of a fresh appeal to the Commons. All opposition was at an end. The strength of the Country party had been broken by the reaction against Shaftesbury's projects, and by the flight and death of its more prominent leaders. Whatever strength it retained lay chiefly in the towns, and these were now attacked by writs of "quo warranto," which called on them to show cause why their charters should not be declared forfeited on the ground of abuse of their privileges. A few verdicts on the side of the Crown brought about a general surrender of municipal liberties; and the grant of fresh charters, in which all but ultra-loyalists were carefully excluded from their corporations, placed the representation of the boroughs in the hands of the Crown. Against active discontent Charles had long been quietly providing by the gradual increase of his Guards. The withdrawal of its garrison from Tangier enabled him to raise their force to nine thousand well-equipped soldiers, and to supplement this force, the nucleus of our present standing army, by a reserve of six regiments, which were maintained, till they should be needed at home, in the service of the United Provinces. But great as the danger really was, it lay not so much in isolated acts of tyranny as in the character and purpose of Charles himself. His death at the very moment of his triumph saved English freedom. He had regained his old popularity, and at the news of his danger in the spring of 1685 crowds thronged the churches, praying that God would raise him up again to be a father to his people. The bishops around his bed fell on their knees and implored his blessing, and Charles with outstretched hands solemnly gave it to them. But while his subjects were praying, and his bishops seeking a blessing, the one anxiety of the King was to die reconciled to the Catholic Church. When his chamber was cleared a priest named Huddleston, who had saved his life after the battle of Worcester, received his confession and administered the last sacraments. Charles died as he had lived: brave, witty, cynical, even in the presence of death. Tortured as he was with pain, he begged the bystanders to forgive him for being so unconscionable a time in

ying. One mistress, the Duchess of Portsmouth, hung weeping over his bed. His last thought was of another mistress, Nell Gwynn. Do not," he whispered to his successor ere he sank into a fatal slumber, "do not let poor Nelly starve!"

The first words of James on his accession in February 1685 were pledge to preserve the laws inviolate, and to protect the Church. he pledge was welcomed by the whole country with enthusiasm. All the suspicions of a Catholic sovereign seemed to have disappeared. "We have the word of a King!" ran the general cry, and of a King who was never worse than his word." The conviction of his brother's faithlessness stood James in good stead. He was looked upon as narrow, impetuous, stubborn, and despotic in part, but even his enemies did not accuse him of being false. Above all he was believed to be keenly alive to the honour of his country, and resolute to free it from foreign dependence. It was necessary to summon a Parliament, for the Royal revenue ceased with the death of the King; but the elections, swayed at once by the tide of loyalty and by the command of the boroughs which the surrender of their charters had given to the Crown, sent up a House of Commons in which James found few members who were not to his mind. The question of religious security was waived at a hint of the Royal displeasure. A revenue of nearly two millions was granted to the King for life. All that was wanted to rouse the loyalty of the country into fanaticism was supplied by a rebellion in the north, and by another under Monmouth in the west. The hopes of Scotch freedom had clung ever since the Restoration to the house of Argyle. The great Marquis, as we have seen, had been brought to the block at the Restoration. His son, the Earl of Argyle, had been unable to save himself even by a life of singular caution and obedience from the ill-will of the vile politicians who governed Scotland. He was at last convicted of treason on grounds which every English statesman stood aghast. "We should not hang a dog here," Halifax protested, "on the grounds on which my lord Argyle has been sentenced to death." The Earl escaped however to Holland, and lived peaceably there during the six last years of the reign of Charles. Monmouth found the same refuge at the Hague, where a belief in his father's love and purpose to recall him secured him a kindly reception from William of Orange. But the accession of James was a death-blow to the hopes of the Duke, while it stirred the fanaticism of Argyle to a resolve of wresting Scotland from the rule of a Popish king. The two leaders determined to appear in arms in England and the North, and the two expeditions sailed within a few days of each other. Argyle's attempt was soon over. His clan of the Campbells rose on his landing in Montrose, but the country had been occupied for the King, and arrears among the exiles who accompanied him robbed his effort of every chance of success. His force scattered without a fight; and Argyle, arrested in an attempt to escape, was hurried to a prison. His death. Monmouth for a time found brighter fortune. His

1682
to
1688

James
the
Second

1682
to
1688

popularity in the west was great, and though the gentry held aloof when he landed at Lyme, the farmers and traders of Devonshire and Dorset flocked to his standard. The clothier-towns of Somerset were still true to the Whig cause, and on the entrance of the Duke into Taunton the popular enthusiasm showed itself in flowers which wreathed every door, as well as in a train of young girls who presented Monmouth with a Bible and a flag. His forces now amounted to six thousand men, but whatever chance of success he might have had was lost by his assumption of the title of King. The gentry, still true to the cause of Mary and of William, held stubbornly aloof, while the Guards hurried to the scene of the revolt, and the militia gathered to the Royal standard. Foiled in an attempt on Bristol and Bath, Monmouth fell back on Bridgewater, and flung himself in the night of the sixth of July, 1685, on the King's forces, which lay encamped on Sedgemoor. The surprise failed; and the brave peasants and miners who followed the Duke, checked in their advance by a deep drain which crossed the moor, were broken after a short resistance by the Royal horse. Their leader fled from the field, and after a vain effort to escape from the realm, was captured and sent pitilessly to the block.

The
Bloody
Assize

Never had England shown a firmer loyalty; but its loyalty was changed into horror by the terrible measures of repression which followed on the victory of Sedgemoor. Even North, the Lord Keeper, a servile tool of the Crown, protested against the license and bloodshed in which the troops were suffered to indulge after the battle. His protest however was disregarded, and he withdrew broken-hearted from the Court to die. James was, in fact, resolved on a far more terrible vengeance; and the Chief-Justice Jeffreys, a man of great natural powers but of violent temper, was sent to earn the Seals by a series of judicial murders which have left his name a byword for cruelty. Three hundred and fifty rebels were hanged in the "Bloody Circuit," as Jeffreys made his way through Dorset and Somerset. More than eight hundred were sold into slavery beyond sea. A yet larger number were whipped and imprisoned. The Queen, the maids of honour, the courtiers, even the Judge himself, made shameless profit from the sale of pardons. What roused pity above all were the cruelties wreaked upon women. Some were scourged from market-town to market-town. Mrs. Lisle, the wife of one of the Regicides, was sent to the block at Winchester for harbouring a rebel. Elizabeth Gaunt, for the same act of womanly charity, was burned at Tyburn. Pity turned into horror when it was found that cruelty such as this was avowed and sanctioned by the King. Even the cold heart of General Churchill, to whose energy the victory at Sedgemoor had mainly been owing, revolted at the ruthlessness with which James turned away from all appeals for mercy. "This marble," he cried as he struck the chimney-piece on which he leant, "is not harder than the King's heart." But it was soon plain that the terror which the butchery was meant to strike into the people was part of a larger

purpose. The revolt was made a pretext for a vast increase of the standing army. Charles, as we have seen, had silently and cautiously raised it to nearly ten thousand men; James raised it at one sweep to twenty thousand. The employment of this force was to be at home, not abroad, for the hope of an English policy in foreign affairs had already faded away. In the design which James had at heart he could look for no consent from Parliament; and however his pride revolted against a dependence on France, it was only by French gold and French soldiers that he could hope to hold the Parliament permanently at bay. A week therefore after his accession he assured Lewis that his gratitude and devotion to him equalled that of Charles himself. "Tell your master," he said to the French ambassador, "that without his protection I can do nothing. He has a right to be consulted, and it is my wish to consult him, about everything." The pledge of subservience was rewarded with the promise of a subsidy, and the promise was received with expressions of delight and servility which Charles could have mocked at.

1682
to
1688

Never had the secret league with France seemed so full of danger to English religion. Europe had long been trembling at the ambition of Lewis; it was trembling now at his bigotry. He had proclaimed warfare against civil liberty in his attack upon Holland; he declared war at this moment upon religious freedom by revoking the Edict of Nantes, the measure by which Henry the Fourth, after his abandonment of Protestantism, secured toleration and the free exercise of their worship for his Protestant subjects. It had been respected by Richelieu even in his victory over the Huguenots, and only lightly tampered with by Mazarin. But from the beginning of his reign Lewis had resolved to set aside its provisions, and his revocation of it in 1685 was only the natural issue of a progressive system of persecution. The Revocation was followed by outrages more cruel than even the bloodshed of Alva. Prisons were quartered on Protestant families, women were flung from their sick-beds into the streets, children were torn from their mothers' arms to be brought up in Catholicism, ministers were sent to the galleys. In spite of the royal edicts, which forbade even flight to the victims of these horrible atrocities, a hundred thousand Protestants fled over the borders, and Holland, Switzerland, the Rhineland, were filled with French exiles. Thousands found refuge

The
Tyranny

in England, and their industry founded in the fields east of London the silk trade of Spitalfields. But while Englishmen were quivering with horror at the news from France, James in defiance of the law was filling his new army with Catholic officers. He dismissed Halifax on his refusal to consent to a plan for repealing the Test Act, and met the Parliament in 1686 with a haughty declaration that whether legal or no his grant of commissions to Catholics must not be questioned, and a demand of supplies for his new troops. Royal as was the temper of the Houses, their alarm at Popery and the standing army was yet stronger than their loyalty. The

1680

1682
to
1688

Commons by the majority of a single vote deferred the grant of supplies till grievances were redressed, and demanded in their address the recall of the illegal commissions. The Lords took a bolder tone; and the protest of the bishops against any infringement of the Test Act was backed by the eloquence of Halifax. But both Houses were at once prorogued. The King resolved to obtain from the judges what he could not obtain from Parliament. He remodelled the bench by dismissing four judges who refused to lend themselves to his plans; and their successors decided in the case of Sir Edward Hales, a Catholic officer in the Royal army, that a Royal dispensation could be pleaded in bar of the Test Act. The principle laid down by the judges asserted the right of the Crown to override the laws; and it was applied by James with a reckless impatience of all decency and self-restraint. Catholics were admitted into civil and military offices without stint, and four Roman Catholic peers were sworn as members of the Privy Council. The laws which forbade the presence of Catholic priests in the realm or the open exercise of Catholic worship were set at naught. A gorgeous chapel was opened in the Palace of St. James for the worship of the King. Carmelites, Benedictines, Franciscans, appeared in their religious garb in the streets of London, and the Jesuits set up a crowded school in the Savoy.

James
and the
Church

The quick growth of discontent at these acts would have startled a wiser man into prudence, but James prided himself on the reckless violence of his procedure. A riot which took place on the opening of a fresh Catholic chapel in the City was followed by the establishment of a camp of thirteen thousand men at Hounslow to overawe the capital. The course which James intended to follow in England was shown by the course he was following in the sister kingdoms. In Scotland he acted as a pure despot. He placed its government in the hands of two lords, Melfort and Perth, who had embraced his own religion, and put a Catholic in command of the Castle of Edinburgh. Under Charles the Scotch Parliament had been the mere creature of the Crown, but servile as were its members, there was a point at which their servility stopped. When James boldly required from them the toleration of Catholics, they refused to pass such an Act. It was in vain that the King tempted them to consent by the offer of a free trade with England. "Shall we sell our God?" was the indignant reply. James at once ordered the Scotch judges to treat all laws against Catholics as null and void, and his orders were obeyed. In Ireland his policy threw off even the disguise of law. Papists were admitted by the King's command to the Council and to civil offices. A Catholic, Lord Tyrconnell, was put at the head of the army, and set instantly about its reorganization by cashiering Protestant officers and by admitting two thousand Catholic natives into its ranks. Meanwhile James had begun in England a bold and systematic attack upon the Church. He regarded his ecclesiastical supremacy as a weapon providentially left to him for undoing the work which it had

abled his predecessors to do. Under Henry and Elizabeth it had been used to turn the Church of England from Catholic to Protestant. Under James it should be used to turn it back again from Protestant to Catholic. The High Commission indeed had been declared illegal by an Act of the Long Parliament, and this Act had been confirmed by the Parliament of the Restoration. But the statute was roughly set aside. Seven Commissioners were appointed in 1686 for the government of the Church, with Jeffreys at their head; and the first blow of the Commission was at the Bishop of London. James had forbidden the clergy to preach against Popery, and ordered Bishop Compton to suspend a London parson who set this order at defiance. The Bishop's refusal was punished by his own suspension. But the pressure of the Commission only drove the clergy to a bolder defiance of the Royal will. Sermons against superstition were preached from every pulpit; and the two most famous divines of the day, Tillotson and Stillingfleet, put themselves at the head of a host of controversialists who scattered pamphlets and tracts from every printing press.

Foiled in his direct efforts to overawe the Church, James resolved to attack it in the great institutions which had till now been its stronghold. To secure the Universities for Catholicism was to seize the only training schools which the clergy possessed. Cambridge indeed escaped easily. A Benedictine monk who presented himself with Royal letters recommending him for the degree of a master of arts was rejected on his refusal to sign the Articles: and the Vice-Chancellor paid for the rejection by dismissal from his office. But a far more violent and obstinate attack was directed against Oxford. The Master of University College, who declared himself convert, was authorized to retain his post in defiance of the law. Massey, a Roman Catholic, was presented by the Crown to the deanery of Christ Church. Magdalen was the wealthiest Oxford college, and James in 1687 recommended one Farmer, a Catholic of infamous life and not even qualified by statute for the office, to its vacant headship. The Fellows remonstrated, and on the rejection of their remonstrance chose Hough, one of their own number, as their President. The Commission declared the election void; and James, shamed out of his first candidate, recommended a second, Parker, Bishop of Oxford, a Catholic in heart and the warmest of his courtiers. But the Fellows held stubbornly to their gal head. It was in vain that the King visited Oxford, summoned them to his presence, and rated them as they knelt before him like schoolboys. "I am King," he said, "I will be obeyed! Go to your chapel, this instant, and elect the Bishop! Let those who refuse ob-
ok to it, for they shall feel the whole weight of my hand!" It was felt that to give Magdalen as well as Christ Church into Catholic hands was to turn Oxford into a Catholic seminary, and the King's threats were calmly disregarded. But they were soon carried out. A special Commission visited the University, pronounced Hough an intruder, set aside his appeal to the law, burst open the door of

1682
to
1688

James
and the
Universi-
ties

1682 his President's house to install Parker in his place, and on their
 to refusal to submit deprived the Fellows of their fellowships. The
 1688 expulsion of the Fellows was followed on a like refusal by that of
 the Demies. Parker, who died immediately after his installation,
 was succeeded by a Roman Catholic bishop in partibus, Bonaventura Giffard, and twelve Catholics were admitted to fellowships
 in a single day.

Declara- The work James was doing in the Church he was doing with as
 tion of mad a recklessness in the State. Parliament, which had been kept
 of silent by prorogation after prorogation, was finally dissolved; and
 gence the King was left without a check in his defiance of the law. It was
 in vain that the bulk of the Catholic gentry stood aloof and pre-
 1687 dicted the inevitable reaction his course must bring about, or that
 Rome itself counselled greater moderation. James was infatuated
 with the success of his enterprises. He resolved to show the world
 that even the closest ties of blood were as nothing to him if they
 conflicted with the demands of his faith. His marriage with Anne
 Hyde, the daughter of Clarendon, bound both the Chancellor's sons
 to his fortunes; and on his accession he had sent his elder brother-
 in-law, Edward, Earl of Clarendon, as Lord Lieutenant to Ireland,
 and raised the younger, Laurence, Earl of Rochester, to the post
 of Lord Treasurer. But Rochester was now told that the King
 could not safely entrust so great a charge to anyone who did not
 share his sentiments on religion, and on his refusal to abandon his
 faith he was driven from office. His brother, Clarendon, shared his
 fall. A Catholic, Lord Bellasys, became First Lord of the Treasury,
 which was put into commission after Rochester's removal; and
 another Catholic, Lord Arundell, became Lord Privy Seal. Petre,
 a Jesuit, was called to the Privy Council. The Nuncio of the Pope
 was received in state at Windsor. But even James could hardly fail
 to perceive the growth of public discontent. The great Tory nobles,
 if they were staunch for the Crown, were as resolute Englishmen in
 their hatred of mere tyranny as the Whigs themselves. James gave
 the Duke of Norfolk the sword of State to carry before him as he
 went to Mass. The Duke stopped at the Chapel door. "Your
 father would have gone further," said the King. "Your Majesty's
 father was the better man," replied the Duke, "and he would not
 have gone so far." The young Duke of Somerset was ordered to
 introduce the Nuncio into the Presence Chamber. "I am advised,"
 he answered, "that I cannot obey your Majesty without breaking
 the law." "Do you not know that I am above the law?" James
 asked angrily. "Your Majesty may be, but I am not," retorted
 the Duke. He was dismissed from his post; but the spirit of
 resistance spread fast. In spite of the King's letters, the governors
 of the Charter House, who numbered among them some of the
 greatest English nobles, refused to admit a Catholic to the benefits
 of the foundation. The most devoted loyalists began to murmur
 when James demanded apostasy as a proof of their loyalty. He
 had soon in fact to abandon all hope of bringing the Church or the

ories over to his will. He turned, as Charles had turned, to the nonconformists, and published in 1687 a Declaration of Indulgence which annulled the penal laws against Nonconformists and Catholics alike, and abrogated every Act which imposed a test as qualification for office in Church or State. The temptation to accept such an offer was great, for, since the fall of Shaftesbury, persecution had fallen heavily on the Protestant dissidents, and we can hardly wonder that the Nonconformists wavered for a time. But the great body of them, and all the more venerable names among them, remained true to the cause of freedom. Baxter, Howe, Bunyan, all refused an Indulgence which could only be purchased by the violent overthrow of the law. A mere handful of addresses could be procured by the utmost pressure, and it was soon plain that the attempt to divide the forces of Protestantism had utterly failed.

The failure of his Declaration only spurred James to an attempt to procure a repeal of the Test Act from Parliament itself. But no such Parliament could be brought, as he knew, to consent to its repeal. The Lords indeed could be swamped by lavish creations of new peers. "Your troop of horse," his minister, Lord Sunderland, told Churchill, "shall be called up into the House of Lords." But it was a harder matter to secure a compliant House of Commons. The Lord Lieutenants were directed to bring about such a "regulation" of the governing body in boroughs as would ensure the return of candidates pledged to the repeal of the Test, and to restore every magistrate in their county as to his vote. Half of them at once refused, and a long list of great nobles—the Earls of Oxford, Shrewsbury, Dorset, Derby, Pembroke, Rutland, Abercromby, Thanet, Northampton, and Abingdon—were at once dismissed from their Lord Lieutenancies. The justices when questioned simply replied that they would vote according to their consciences, and send members to Parliament who would protect the Protestant religion. After repeated "regulations" it was found impossible to form a corporate body which would return representatives willing to comply with the Royal will. All thought of a Parliament had to be abandoned; and even the most bigoted courtiers counselled moderation at this proof of the stubborn opposition which James must prepare to encounter from the peers, the gentry, and the trading classes. The clergy alone still hesitated to any open act of resistance. Even the tyranny of the Commission and the attack on the Universities failed to rouse into open disaffection men who had been preaching Sunday after Sunday the doctrine of passive obedience to the worst of kings. But James seemed resolved to rouse them. On the twenty-seventh of April, 1688, he issued a fresh Declaration of Indulgence, and ordered every clergyman to read it during divine service on two successive Sundays. Little time was given for deliberation, but little time was needed. The clergy refused almost to a man to be the instruments of their own humiliation. The Declaration was read in only

1682
to
1688

The
Seven
Bishops

four of the London churches, and in these the congregation flocked out of church at the first words of it. Nearly all of the country clergy refused to obey the Royal orders. The Bishops went with the rest of the clergy. A few days before the appointed Sunday Archbishop Sancroft called his suffragans together, and the six who were able to appear at Lambeth signed a temperate protest to the King, in which they declined to publish an illegal Declaration. "It is a standard of rebellion," James exclaimed as the Primate presented the paper; and the resistance of the clergy was no sooner announced to him than he determined to wreak his vengeance on the Prelates who had signed the protest. He ordered the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to deprive them of their sees, but in this matter even the Commissioners shrunk from obeying him. The Chancellor, Lord Jeffreys, advised a prosecution for libel as an easier mode of punishment; and the Bishops, who refused to give bail, were committed on this charge to the Tower. They passed to their prison amidst the shouts of a great multitude, the sentinels knelt for their blessing as they entered its gates, and the soldiers of the garrison drank their healths. So threatening was the temper of the nation that his ministers pressed James to give way. But his obstinacy grew with the danger. "Indulgence," he said, "ruined my father;" and on June the 29th the Bishops appeared as criminals at the bar of the King's Bench. The jury had been packed, the judges were mere tools of the Crown, but judges and jury were alike overawed by the indignation of the people at large. No sooner had the foreman of the jury uttered the words "Not guilty" than a roar of applause burst from the crowd, and horsemen spurred along every road to carry over the country the news of the acquittal.

SECTION VII.—WILLIAM OF ORANGE

[*Authorities.*—As under the previous section. For the documents of this and the succeeding periods, see Robertson, "Select Statutes, Cases, and Documents."]

The
Great-
ness of
France

Amidst the tumult of the Plot and the Exclusion Bill the wiser among English statesmen had fixed their hopes steadily on the succession of Mary, the elder daughter and heiress of James. The tyranny of her father's reign made this succession the hope of the people at large. But to Europe the importance of the change, whenever it should come about, lay not so much in the succession of Mary, as in the new power which such an event would give to her husband, William Prince of Orange. We have come in fact to a moment when the struggle of England against the aggression of its King blends with the larger struggle of Europe against the aggression of Lewis the Fourteenth, and it is only by a rapid glance at the political state of the Continent that we can understand the real

ature and results of the Revolution which drove James from the throne.

At this moment France was the dominant power in Christendom. The religious wars which began with the Reformation broke the strength of the nations around her. Spain was no longer able to fight the battle of Catholicism. The Peace of Westphalia, by the independence it gave to the German princes and the jealousy it left live between the Protestant and Catholic powers, destroyed the strength of the Empire. The German branch of the House of Austria, spent with the long struggle of the Thirty Years' War, had enough to do in battling hard against the advance of the Turks from Hungary on Vienna. The victories of Gustavus and of the generals whom he formed had been dearly purchased by the exhaustion of Sweden. The United Provinces were as yet hardly regarded as a great power, and were trammelled by their contest with England for the empire of the seas. England, which under Cromwell promised for a moment to take the lead in Europe, sank under Charles and James into a dependency of France. France alone profited by the general wreck. The wise policy of Henry the fourth in securing religious peace by a toleration to the Protestants had undone the ill effects of its religious wars. The Huguenots were still numerous south of the Loire, but the loss of their fortresses had turned their energies into the peaceful channels of industry and trade. Feudal disorder was roughly put down by Richelieu, and the policy by which he gathered all local power into the hands of the crown, though fatal in the end to the real welfare of France, gave it for the moment an air of good government and a command over its internal resources which no other country could boast. A compact and fertile territory, the natural activity and enterprise of its people, and the rapid growth of its commerce and of manufactures were sources of natural wealth which even its heavy taxation failed to check. In the latter half of the seventeenth century France was looked upon as the wealthiest power in Europe. The yearly income of the French crown was double that of England, and even Lewis the Fourteenth trusted as much to the credit of his treasury as to the glory of his arms. "After all," he said, when the fortunes of war began to turn against him, "it is the last sovereign which must win!" It was in fact this superiority in wealth which enabled France to set on foot forces such as had never been seen in Europe since the downfall of Rome. At the opening of the reign of Lewis the Fourteenth its army mustered a hundred thousand men. With the war against Holland it rose to nearly two hundred thousand. In the last struggle against the Grand Alliance there was a time when it counted nearly half a million of men in arms. Nor was France content with these enormous land forces. Since the ruin of Spain the fleets of Holland and of England had alone disputed the empire of the seas. Under Richelieu and Mazarin France could hardly be looked upon as a naval power. But the early years of Lewis saw the creation of a navy of 100 men-of-war,

and the fleets of France soon held their own against England or the Dutch.

Lewis
the Four-
teenth

Such a power would have been formidable at any time; but it was doubly formidable when directed by statesmen who in knowledge and ability were without rivals in Europe. No diplomatist could compare with Lionne, no war minister with Louvois, no financier with Colbert. Their young master, Lewis the Fourteenth, bigoted, narrow-minded, commonplace as he was, without personal honour or personal courage, without gratitude and without pity, insane in his pride, insatiable in his vanity, brutal in his selfishness, had still many of the qualities of a great ruler: industry, patience, quickness of resolve, firmness of purpose, a capacity for discerning greatness and using it, an immense self-belief and self-confidence, and a temper utterly destitute indeed of real greatness, but with a dramatic turn for seeming to be great. As a politician Lewis had simply to reap the harvest which the two great Cardinals who went before him had sown. Both had used to the profit of France the exhaustion and dissension which the wars of religion had brought upon Europe. Richelieu turned the scale against the House of Austria by his alliance with Sweden, with the United Provinces, and with the Protestant princes of Germany; and the two great treaties by which Mazarin ended the Thirty Years' War, the Treaty of Westphalia and the Treaty of the Pyrenees, left the Empire disorganized and Spain powerless. From that moment indeed Spain had sunk into a strange decrepitude. Robbed of the chief source of her wealth by the independence of Holland, weakened at home by the revolt of Portugal, her infantry annihilated by Condé in his victory of Rocroi, her fleet ruined by the Dutch, her best blood drained away to the Indies, the energies of her people destroyed by the suppression of all liberty, civil or religious, her intellectual life crushed by the Inquisition, her industry crippled by the expulsion of the Moors, by financial oppression, and by the folly of her colonial system, the kingdom which under Philip the Second had aimed at the empire of the world lay helpless and exhausted under Philip the Fourth. The aim of Lewis from 1661, the year when he really became master of France, was to carry on the policy of his predecessors, and above all to complete the ruin of Spain. The conquest of the Spanish provinces in the Netherlands would carry his border to the Scheldt. A more distant hope lay in the probable extinction of the Austrian line which now sat on the throne of Spain. By securing the succession to their throne for a French prince, not only Castile and Arragon with the Spanish dependencies in Italy and the Netherlands, but the Spanish empire in the New World would be added to the dominions of France. Nothing could save Spain but a union of the European powers, and to prevent this union by his negotiations was a work at which Lewis toiled for years. The intervention of the Empire was prevented by a renewal of the old alliances between France and the lesser German princes. A league with the Turks gave Austria

enough to do on her eastern border. The policy of Charles the Second bound England to inaction. Spain was at last completely isolated, and the death of Philip the Fourth gave a pretence for war of which Lewis availed himself in 1667. Flanders was occupied in two months. Franche-Comté was seized in seventeen days. But the suddenness and completeness of the French success awoke a general terror before which the King's skilful diplomacy gave way. Holland was roused to a sense of danger at home by the appearance of French arms on the Rhine. England woke from her lethargy on the French seizure of the coast-towns of Flanders. Sweden joined the two Protestant powers in the Triple Alliance; and the dread of a wider league forced Lewis to content himself with the southern half of Flanders and the possession of a string of fortresses which practically left him master of the Netherlands.

Lewis was maddened by the check. He not only hated the Dutch as Protestants and Republicans; but he saw in them an obstacle which had to be taken out of the way ere he could resume his attack on Spain. Four years were spent in preparations for a decisive blow at this new enemy. The French army was raised to a hundred and eighty thousand men. Colbert created a fleet which rivalled that of Holland in number and equipment. Sweden was again won over. England was again secured by the Treaty of Dover. Meanwhile Holland lay wrapt in a false security. The alliance with France had been its traditional policy, and it was especially dear to the party of the great merchant class which had mounted to power on the fall of the House of Orange. John de Witt, the leader of this party, though he had been forced to conclude the Triple Alliance by the advance of Lewis to the Rhine, still clung blindly to the friendship of France. His trust only broke down when the French army crossed the Dutch border in 1672 and the glare of its watch-fires was seen from the walls of Amsterdam. For the moment Holland lay crushed at the feet of Lewis, but the arrogance of the conqueror roused again the stubborn courage which had wrung victory from Alva and worn out the pride of Philip the Second. The fall of De Witt raised the Orange party again to power, and called the Prince of Orange to the head of the Republic. Though the young Stadholder had hardly reached manhood, his great qualities at once made themselves felt. His earlier life had schooled him in a wonderful self-control. He had been left fatherless and all but friendless in childhood, he had been bred among men who looked on his very existence as a danger to the State, his words had been watched, his looks noted, his friends jealously withdrawn. In such an atmosphere the boy grew up silent, wary, self-contained, grave in temper, cold in demeanour, blunt and even repulsive in address. He was weak and sickly from his cradle, and manhood brought with it an asthma and consumption which shook his frame with a constant cough; his face was sullen and bloodless and scored with deep lines which told of ceaseless pain. But beneath his cold and sickly presence lay a fiery and commanding temper,

William
of
Orange

an immoveable courage, and a political ability of the highest order. William was a born statesman. Neglected as his education had been in other ways, for he knew nothing of letters or of art, he had been carefully trained in politics by John de Witt; and the wide knowledge with which in his first address to the States-General the young Stadholder reviewed the general state of Europe, the cool courage with which he calculated the chances of the struggle, at once won him the trust of his countrymen. Their trust was soon rewarded. Holland was saved, and province after province won back from the arms of France, by William's dauntless resolve. Like his great ancestor, William the Silent, he was a luckless commander, and no general had to bear more frequent defeats. But he profited by defeat as other men profit by victory. His bravery indeed was of that nobler cast which rises to its height in moments of ruin and dismay. The coolness with which, boy-general as he was, he rallied his broken squadrons amidst the rout of Seneff and wrested from Condé at the last the fruits of his victory, moved his veteran opponent to a generous admiration. It was in such moments indeed that the real temper of the man broke through the veil of his usual reserve. A strange light flashed from his eyes as soon as he was under fire, and in the terror and confusion of defeat his manners took an ease and gaiety that charmed every soldier around him.

William
and
Charles
II.

The political ability of William was seen in the skill with which he drew Spain and the Empire into a coalition against France. But France was still matchless in arms, and the effect of her victories was seconded by the selfishness of the allies, and above all by the treacherous diplomacy of Charles the Second. William was forced to consent in 1679 to the Treaty of Nimeguen, which left France dominant over Europe as she had never been before. Holland indeed was saved from the revenge of Lewis, but fresh spoils had been wrested from Spain, and Franche-Comté, which had been restored at the close of the former war, was retained at the end of this. Above all France overawed Europe by the daring and success with which she had faced, single-handed, the wide coalition against her. Her King's arrogance became unbounded. Lorraine was turned into a subject-state. Genoa was bombarded, and its Doge forced to seek pardon in the antechambers of Versailles. The Pope was humiliated by the march of an army upon Rome to avenge a slight offered to the French ambassador. The Empire was outraged by a shameless seizure of Imperial fiefs in Elsass and elsewhere. The whole Protestant world was defied by the horrible cruelties which followed the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. In the mind of Lewis peace meant a series of outrages on the powers around him, but every outrage helped the cool and silent adversary who was looking on from the Hague to build up the Great Alliance of all Europe, from which alone he looked for any effectual check to the ambition of France. The experience of the last war had taught William that of such an alliance England must form a part:

and we have already seen how much English politics were influenced during the reign of Charles by the struggle between William and Lewis to secure English aid. A reconciliation of the King with his Parliament was an indispensable step towards freeing Charles from his dependence on France, and it was to such a reconciliation that William at first bent his efforts, but he was foiled by the readiness with which Charles clung to the power whose aid was needful to carry out the schemes which he was contemplating. In his leaning towards France however Charles stood utterly alone. His most devoted ministers foiled their sovereign's efforts as far as they could. Even Arlington, Catholic as at heart he was, refused to look on while France made the Flemish coast its own, and despatched Temple to frame the Triple Alliance which defeated its hopes. Danby was even more hostile to France, and in wresting from his master permission to offer William the hand of Mary he dealt Lewis what proved to be a fatal blow. James was without a son, and the marriage with Mary secured to William on his father-in-law's death the aid of England in his great enterprise. But it was impossible to wait for that event, and though William used his new position to bring Charles round to a more patriotic policy, his efforts were still fruitless. The storm of the Popish Plot complicated his position. In the earlier stages of the Exclusion Bill, when the Parliament seemed resolved simply to pass over James and to seat Mary at once on the throne after her uncle's death, William stood apart from the struggle, doubtful of its issue, though prepared to accept the good luck if it came to him. The fatal error of Shaftesbury in advancing the claims of Monmouth forced him into activity. To preserve his wife's right of succession, with all the great issues which were to come of it, no other course was left him than to adopt the cause of the Duke of York. In the crisis of the struggle, therefore, William threw his whole weight on the side of James. The eloquence of Halifax secured the rejection of the Exclusion Bill, and Halifax (as we know now) was the mouthpiece of William.

But while England was seething with the madness of the Popish William lot and of the royalist reaction, the great European struggle was drawing nearer and nearer. The patience of Germany was worn out, and in 1686 its princes bound themselves in the Treaty of Augsburg to resist further aggressions on the part of France. From that moment a fresh war became inevitable, and William watched the course of his father-in-law with redoubled anxiety. His efforts in England had utterly failed. James had renewed his brother's secret treaty with France, and plunged into a quarrel with his people which of itself would have prevented him from giving any aid in a struggle abroad. The Prince could only silently look on, with a desperate hope that James might yet be brought to a nobler policy. He refused all encouragement to the leading malcontents who were already calling on him to interfere in arms. On the other hand he declined to support the King in his schemes for the abolition of the

William
and
James
II.

Test. "You ask me," he said to his father-in-law, "to countenance an attack on my religion. That I cannot do!" If he still cherished hopes of bringing about a peace between the King and people which might enable him to enlist England in the Grand Alliance, they vanished in 1687 before the Declaration of Indulgence. In union with Mary he addressed a temperate protest against this measure to the King. But the discovery of the plans which James was now forming, plans which were intended to rob Mary of a part of her future dominions as well as to cripple for ever the power of England, forced him at last into earnest action. The King felt strong enough to carry through his system of government during his own lifetime; but the protest of Mary and William left little doubt that the changes he had made would be overthrown at his death. He resolved therefore (if we trust the statement of the French ambassador) to place Ireland in such a position of independence that she might serve as a refuge for his Catholic subjects from any Protestant successor. Clarendon was succeeded in the charge of the island by the Catholic Lord Tyrconnell, and the new governor went roughly to work. Every Englishman was turned out of office. Every Judge, every Privy Councillor, every Mayor and Alderman of a borough, was soon a Catholic and an Irishman. In a few months the English ascendancy was overthrown, and the life and fortune of every English settler were at the mercy of the natives on whom they had trampled since Cromwell's day. The Irish army, purged of its Protestant soldiers, was entrusted to Catholic officers, and the dread of another massacre spread panic through the island. Fifteen hundred Protestant families fled terror-stricken across the Channel. The rest of the Protestants gathered together and prepared for self-defence. William had a right on Mary's behalf to guard against such a plan of dismembering her inheritance; and Dykvelt, who was despatched as his ambassador to England, organized with wonderful ability the various elements of disaffection into a compact opposition. Danby and Bishop Compton answered for the Church. The Nonconformists were won by a promise of toleration. A regular correspondence was established between the Prince and some of the great nobles. But William still shrank from the plan of an intervention in arms. General as the disaffection undoubtedly was, the position of James seemed to be secure. He counted on the aid of France. He had an army of twenty thousand men. Scotland, crushed by the failure of Argyle's rising, could give no such aid as it gave to the Long Parliament. Ireland was ready to rise for the Catholic cause and to throw, if needed, its soldiers on the western coast. Above all it was doubtful if in England itself disaffection would turn into actual rebellion. The "Bloody Assize" had left its terror on the Whigs. The Tories and the Churchmen, angered as they were, were still hampered by their doctrine of non-resistance. It was still therefore the aim of William to discourage all violent counsels, and to confine himself to organizing such a general opposition as would force

James by legal means to reconcile himself to the country, to abandon his policy at home and abroad, and to join the alliance against France.

But at this moment the whole course of William's policy was changed by an unforeseen event. His own patience and that of the nation rested on the certainty of Mary's succession; for James was without a son, and five years had passed since the last pregnancy of his second wife, Mary of Modena. But in the midst of the King's struggle with the Church it was announced that the Queen was again with child. Though the news was received with general disbelief, it at once forced on the crisis which William had hoped to defer. If, as the Catholics joyously foretold, the child were a boy, and, as was certain, brought up a Catholic, the highest Tory had to resolve at last whether the tyranny under which England lay should go on for ever. William could no longer blind himself to the need of a struggle and a speedy one. "It is now or never," he said to Dykvelt. The hesitation of England was indeed at an end. Fanby, loyal above all to the Church and firm in his hatred of subservience to France, answered for the Tories; Compton for the High Churchmen, goaded at last into rebellion by the Declaration of Indulgence. The Earl of Devonshire, the Lord Cavendish of the exclusion struggle, answered for the Whigs. A formal invitation to William to intervene in arms for the restoration of English liberty and the protection of the Protestant religion was signed by these leaders and carried in June to the Hague by Herbert, the most popular of English seamen, who had been deprived of his command for a refusal to vote against the Test. The nobles who signed it called on William to appear with an army, and pledged themselves to rise in arms on his landing. Whatever lingering hesitation remained was swept away by the Trial of the Bishops and the birth of a Prince of Wales. The invitation was sent from London on the very day of the Acquittal. The general excitement, the shouts of the boats which covered the river, the bonfires in every street, showed indeed that the country was on the eve of revolt. The army itself, on which James had implicitly relied, suddenly showed its sympathy with the people. James was at a loss when the news of the Acquittal reached him, and as he rode from the camp he heard a great shout behind him. "What is that?" he asked. "It is nothing," was the reply, "only the soldiers are glad that the Bishops are acquitted!" "Do you call that nothing?" grumbled the King. The shout told him that he stood utterly alone in his realm. The peerage, the gentry, the bishops, the clergy, the Universities, every lawyer, every trader, every farmer, stood aloof from him. His very soldiers forsook him. The most devoted Catholics pressed him to give way. But to give way was to reverse every act he had done since his accession, and to change the whole nature of his government. All show of legal rule had disappeared. Sheriffs, mayors, magistrates, appointed by the crown in defiance of a parliamentary statute, were no real officers

The
Invitation

in the eye of the law. Even if the Houses were summoned, members returned by officers such as these could form no legal Parliament. Hardly a Minister of the Crown or a Privy Councillor exercised any lawful authority. James had brought things to such a pass that the restoration of legal government meant the absolute reversal of every act he had done. But he was in no mood to reverse his acts. His temper was only spurred to a more dogged obstinacy by danger and remonstrance. He broke up the camp at Hounslow and dispersed its troops in distant cantonments. He dismissed the two judges who had favoured the acquittal of the Bishops. He ordered the chancellor of each diocese to report the names of the clergy who had not read the Declaration of Indulgence. But his will broke fruitlessly against the sullen resistance which met him on every side. Not a chancellor made a return to the Commissioners, and the Commissioners were cowed into inaction by the temper of the nation. When the judges who had displayed their servility to the Crown went on circuit the gentry refused to meet them. A yet fiercer irritation was kindled by the King's resolve to supply the place of the English troops, whose temper proved unserviceable for his purposes, by draughts from the Catholic army which Tyrconnell had raised in Ireland. Even the Roman Catholic peers at the Council table protested against this measure; and six officers in a single regiment laid down their commissions rather than enroll the Irish recruits among their men. The ballad of "Lillibullero," a scurrilous attack on the Irish Papists, was sung from one end of England to the other.

William's
Landing

What prevented revolt was the general resolve to wait for the appearance of the Prince of Orange. William was gathering forces and transports with wonderful rapidity and secrecy, while noble after noble made their way to the Hague. The Earl of Shrewsbury arrived with an offer of £12,000 towards the expedition. Edward Russell, the brother of Lord Russell, appeared as the representative of the House of Bedford. They were followed by the representatives of great Tory houses, by the sons of the Marquis of Winchester, of Lord Danby, of Lord Peterborough, and by the High Church Lord Macclesfield. At home the Earls of Danby and Devonshire prepared silently with Lord Lumley for a rising in the North. In spite of the profound secrecy with which all was conducted, the keen instinct of Sunderland, who had stooped to purchase continuance in office at the price of an apostasy to Catholicism, detected the preparations of William; and the sense that his master's ruin was at hand encouraged him to tell every secret of James on the promise of a pardon for the crimes to which he had lent himself. James alone remained stubborn and insensate as of old. He had no fear of a revolt unaided by the Prince of Orange, and he believed that the threat of a French attack on Holland would render William's aid impossible. But in September the long-delayed war began, and by the greatest political error of his reign Lewis threw his forces not on Holland, but on Germany. The

Dutch at once felt themselves secure; the States-General gave their sanction to William's project, and the armament he had prepared gathered rapidly in the Scheldt. The news no sooner reached England than the King passed from obstinacy to panic. By draughts from Scotland and Ireland he had mustered forty thousand men, but the temper of the troops robbed him of all trust in them. He dissolved the Ecclesiastical Commission. He replaced the magistrates he had driven from office. He restored their franchises to the towns. The Chancellor carried back the Charter of London in state into the City. James dismissed Sunderland from office, and produced before the peers who were in London proofs of the birth of his child, which was almost universally believed to be a Catholic imposture. But concession and proof came too late. Detained by ill winds, beaten back on its first venture by a violent storm, William's fleet of six hundred transports, escorted by fifty men-of-war, anchored on the fifth of November in Torbay; and his army, thirteen thousand men strong, entered Exeter amidst the shouts of its citizens. His coming had not been looked for in the West, and for a week no great landowner joined him. But nobles and squires soon flocked to his camp, and the adhesion of Plymouth secured his rear. Meanwhile Danby, dashing at the head of a hundred horsemen into York, gave the signal for a rising in the North. The militia gave back his shout of "A free Parliament and the Protestant Religion!" Peers and gentry flocked to his standard; and a march on Nottingham united his forces to those under Devonshire, who had mustered at Derby the great lords of the midland and eastern counties. Everywhere the revolt was triumphant. The garrison of Hull declared for a free Parliament. The Duke of Norfolk appeared at the head of three hundred gentlemen in the market-place at Norwich. Townsmen and gownsmen greeted Lord Lovelace at Oxford with uproarious welcome. Bristol threw open its gates to the Prince of Orange, who advanced steadily on Salisbury, where James had mustered his forces. But the Royal army fell back in disorder. Its very leaders were secretly pledged to William, and the desertion of Lord Churchill was followed by that of so many other officers that James abandoned the struggle in despair. He fled to London to hear that his daughter Anne had left St. James' to join Danby at Nottingham. "God help me," cried the wretched King, "for my own children have forsaken me!" His spirit was utterly broken; and though he promised to call the Houses together, and despatched commissioners to Hungerford to treat with William on the terms of a free Parliament, in his heart he had resolved on flight. Parliament, he said to the few who still clung to him, would force on him concessions he could not endure; and he only waited for news of the escape of his wife and child to make his way to the Isle of Sheppey, where a hoy lay ready to carry him to France. Some rough fishermen, who took him for a Jesuit, prevented his escape, and a troop of Life Guards brought him back in safety to London; but it was the policy of

Nov.
1688

William and his advisers to further a flight which removed their chief difficulty out of the way. It would have been hard to depose James had he remained, and perilous to keep him prisoner: but the entry of the Dutch troops into London, the silence of the Prince, and an order to leave St. James', filled the King with fresh terrors, and taking advantage of the means of escape which were almost openly placed at his disposal, James a second time quitted London and embarked on the 23rd of December unhindered for France.

The Re-
volution

Before flying James had burnt most of the writs convoking the new Parliament, had disbanded his army, and destroyed so far as he could all means of government. For a few days there was a wild burst of panic and outrage in London, but the orderly instinct of the people soon reasserted itself. The Lords who were at the moment in London provided on their own authority as Privy Counsellors for the more pressing needs of administration, and resigned their authority into William's hands on his arrival in the capital. The difficulty which arose from the absence of any person legally authorized to call Parliament together was got over by convoking the House of Peers, and forming a second body of all members who had sat in the Commons in the reign of Charles the Second, with the Aldermen and Common Councillors of London. Both bodies requested William to take on himself the provisional government of the kingdom, and to issue circular letters inviting the electors of every town and county to send up representatives to a Convention which met in January, 1689. Both Houses were found equally resolved against any recall of or negotiation with the fallen King. But with this step their unanimity ended. The Whigs, who formed a majority in the Commons, voted a resolution which, illogical and inconsistent as it seemed, was well adapted to unite in its favour every element of the opposition to James: the Churchman who was simply scared by his bigotry, the Tory who doubted the right of a nation to depose its King, the Whig who held the theory of a contract between King and People. They voted that King James, "having endeavoured to subvert the constitution of this kingdom by breaking the original contract between King and People, and by the advice of Jesuits and other wicked persons having violated the fundamental laws, and having withdrawn himself out of the kingdom, has abdicated the Government, and that the throne is thereby vacant." But in the Lords the Tories were still in the ascendant, and the resolution was fiercely debated. Archbishop Sancroft with the High Tories held that no crime could bring about a forfeiture of the crown, and that James still remained King, but that his tyranny had given the nation a right to withdraw from him the actual exercise of government and to entrust its functions to a Regency. The moderate Tories under Danby's guidance admitted that James had ceased to be King, but denied that the throne could be vacant, and contended that from the moment of his abdication the sovereignty vested in his daughter Mary. It was in vain that the eloquence of Halifax backed the Whig

peers in struggling for the resolution of the Commons as it stood. The plan of a Regency was lost by a single vote, and Danby's scheme was adopted by a large majority. But both the Tory courses found a sudden obstacle in William. He declined to be regent. He had no mind, he said to Danby, to be his wife's gentleman-usher. Mary, on the other hand, refused to accept the crown save in conjunction with her husband. The two declarations put an end to the question. It was agreed that William and Mary should be acknowledged as joint sovereigns, but that the actual administration should rest with William alone. Somers, a young lawyer who had just distinguished himself in the trial of the bishops, and who was destined to play a great part in later history, drew up a Declaration of Rights which was presented on February 3th to William and Mary by the two Houses in the banqueting-room at Whitehall. It recited the misgovernment of James, his abdication, and the resolve of the Lords and Commons to assert the ancient rights and liberties of English subjects. It denied the right of any king to exercise a dispensing power, or to exact money to maintain an army save by consent of Parliament. It asserted for the subject a right to petition, to a free choice of representatives in Parliament, and a pure and merciful administration of justice. It declared the right of both Houses to liberty of debate. In full faith that these principles would be accepted and maintained by William and Mary, it ended with declaring the Prince and Princess of Orange King and Queen of England. At the close of the Declaration, Halifax, in the name of the Estates of the Realm, prayed them to receive the crown. William accepted the offer in his own name and his wife's, and declared in a few words the resolve of both to maintain the laws and to govern by advice of Parliament.

SECTION VIII.—THE GRAND ALLIANCE, 1689—1694

[*Authorities.*—As under previous sections, with the addition of the tracts from Bonnet's "Reports," printed in the appendix to Ranke's History of England." For Scotland, the Leven and Melville Papers, and Balcanquhall, "Memoirs Touching the Revolution in Scotland." For Ireland, the anonymous "Light to the Blind," edited by Gilbert as A Jacobite Narrative of the War in Ireland"; Plunket and Hogan, The Jacobite War in Ireland"; Storey's "True and Impartial History"; and Mackay's "Memoirs." The Shrewsbury Correspondence is important in this period. Texts of treaties may be found in Vust, "Grands aînés du Règne de Louis XIV."]

The blunder of Lewis in choosing Germany instead of Holland : his point of attack was all but atoned for by the brilliant successes with which he opened the war. The whole country west of the Rhine was soon in his hands; his armies were master of the flatinate, and penetrated even to Würtemberg. His hopes had never been higher than at the moment when the arrival of James St. Germain dashed all hope to the ground. Lewis was at once

The
Grand
Alliance

thrown back on a war of defence, and the brutal ravages which marked the retreat of his armies from the Rhine revealed the bitterness with which his pride stooped to the necessity. The Palatinate was turned into a desert. The same ruin fell on the stately palace of the Elector at Heidelberg, on the venerable tombs of the Emperors at Speyer, on the town of the trader, on the hut of the vine-dresser. Outrages such as these only hastened the work of his great rival. In accepting the English throne William had knit together England and Holland, the two great Protestant powers whose fleets had the mastery of the sea, as his diplomacy had knit all Germany together a year before in the Treaty of Augsburg. But the formation of the Grand Alliance might still have been delayed by the reluctance of the Emperor to league with Protestant States against a Catholic King, when the ravage of the Palatinate woke a thirst for vengeance in every German heart before which all hesitation passed away. The reception of James as still King of England at St. Germain's gave England just ground for a declaration of war, a step in which it was soon followed by Holland, and the two countries at once agreed to stand by one another in their struggle against France. The adhesion of the Empire and of the two branches of the House of Austria to this agreement completed the Grand Alliance which William had designed. When Savoy joined the allies in May 1689, France found herself girt in on every side save Switzerland with a ring of foes. The Scandinavian kingdoms alone stood aloof from the confederacy of Europe, and their neutrality was unfriendly to France. Lewis was left without a single ally save the Turk: but the energy and quickness of movement which sprang from the concentration of the power of France in a single hand still left the contest an equal one. The Empire was slow; Austria was distracted by the war with the Turks; Spain was all but powerless; Holland and England were alone earnest in the struggle, and England could as yet give little aid in the war. An English brigade, formed from the regiments raised by James, joined the Dutch army on the Sambre, and distinguished itself under Churchill, who had been rewarded for his treason by the title of Earl of Marlborough, in a brisk skirmish with the enemy at Walcourt. But William had as yet grave work to do at home.

^a In England not a sword had been drawn for James. In Scotland ^{ad} his tyranny had been yet greater than in England, and so far as the Lowlands went the fall of his tyranny was as rapid and complete. No sooner had he called his troops southward to meet William's invasion than Edinburgh rose in revolt. The western peasants were at once up in arms, and the Episcopalian clergy who had been the instruments of the Stuart misgovernment ever since the Restoration were rabbled and driven from their parsonages in every parish. The news of these disorders forced William to act, though he was without a show of legal authority over Scotland; and, on the advice of the Scotch Lords present in London, he ventured to summon a Convention similar to that which had been summoned

1689
to
1694

England, and on his own responsibility to set aside the laws which excluded Presbyterians from the Scotch Parliament. This convention resolved that James had forfeited the crown by misgovernment, and offered it to William and Mary. The offer was accompanied by a Claim of Right framed on the model of the Declaration of Rights to which they had consented in England, but adding with a demand for the abolition of Prelacy. Both crown and claim were accepted, and the arrival of the Scotch regiments which William had brought from Holland gave strength to the new Government. Its strength was to be roughly tested. John Graham of Claverhouse, whose cruelties in the persecution of the Western Covenanters had been rewarded by the title of Viscount Dundee, withdrew with a few troopers from Edinburgh to the Highlands, and appealed to the clans. In the Highlands nothing was known of English government or misgovernment: all that the Revolution meant to a Highlander was the restoration of the House of Argyle. The Macdonalds, the Macleans, the Camerons, were as ready to join Dundee in fighting their old oppressors, the Campbells, and the Government which upheld them, as they had been ready to join Montrose in the same cause forty years before. As William's Scotch regiments under General Mackay climbed the Pass of Killiecrankie (July 27, 1689), Dundee charged them at the head of three thousand clansmen and swept them in headlong rout down the glen. But his death in the moment of victory broke the only bond which held the Highlanders together, and in a few weeks the host which had spread terror through the Lowlands melted helplessly away. In the next summer Mackay was able to build the strong post of Fort William in the very heart of the disaffected country, and his offers of money and pardon brought about the submission of the clans. Sir John Dalrymple, the Master of Stair, whose hands the government of Scotland at this time mainly rested, had hoped that a refusal of the oath of allegiance would have grounds for a war of extermination and free Scotland for ever from its terror of the Highlanders. He had provided for the expected refusal by orders of a ruthless severity. "Your troops," he wrote to the officer in command, "will destroy entirely the country of Lochaber, Lochail's lands, Keppoch's, Glengarry's, and Inverness's. Your powers shall be large enough. I hope the soldiers will not trouble the Government with prisoners." But his hopes were disappointed by the readiness with which the clans accepted the offers of the Government. All submitted in good time save Macdonald of Glencoe, whose pride delayed his taking of the oath till six days after the latest date fixed by the proclamation. Foiled in his larger hopes of destruction, Dalrymple seized eagerly on the pretext given by Macdonald, and an order "for the extirpation of that sect of robbers" was laid before William and received the royal signature. "The work," wrote the Master of Stair to Colonel Hamilton who undertook it, "must be secret and sudden." The troops were chosen from among the Campbells, the deadly foes of

1689
to
1694

the clansmen of Glencoe, and quartered peacefully among the Macdonalds for twelve days, till all suspicion of their errand disappeared. At daybreak (Feb. 13, 1692) they fell on their hosts, and in a few moments thirty of the clansfolk lay dead on the snow. The rest, sheltered by a storm, escaped to the mountains to perish for the most part of cold and hunger. "The only thing I regret," said the Master of Stair when the news reached him, "is that any got away." Whatever horror the Massacre of Glencoe has roused in later days, few save Dalrymple knew of it at the time. The peace of the Highlands enabled the work of reorganization to go on quietly at Edinburgh. In accepting the Claim of Right with its repudiation of Prelacy, William had in effect restored the Presbyterian Church, and its restoration was accompanied by the revival of the Westminster Confession as a standard of faith, and by the passing of an Act which abolished lay patronage. Against the Toleration Act which the King proposed, the Scotch Parliament stood firm. But the King was as firm in his purpose as the Parliament. So long as he reigned, William declared in memorable words, there should be no persecution for conscience sake. "We never could be of that mind that violence was suited to the advancing of true religion, nor do we intend that our authority shall ever be a tool to the irregular passions of any party."

The
Irish
Revolt

It was not in Scotland, however, but in Ireland that James and Lewis hoped to arrest William's progress. As we have noticed before, James had resolved soon after his accession to make Ireland a refuge for himself and his Catholic subjects in case of mishap. As we have seen, Lord Tyrconnell had been made general, and then raised to the post of Lord Deputy, with a view to the carrying out of this purpose; the army had been remodelled, by the disbanding its Protestant soldiers and filling the ranks with Papists; a similar process had "purified" the bench of judges; the town charters had been seized into the King's hands, and Catholic Mayors and Catholic Sheriffs set at the head of every city and county. With power thus placed in the hands of their bitter enemies, the terror of a new Irish massacre spread fast among the humbled Protestants. Those of the south for the most part forsook their homes and fled over sea, while those of the north drew together at Enniskillen and Londonderry. The news of the King's fall intensified the panic. For two months Tyrconnell intrigued with William's Government, but his aim was simply to gain time, and at the opening of 1689 a flag was hoisted over Dublin Castle, with the words embroidered on its folds "Now or Never." The signal called every Catholic to arms. The maddened natives flung themselves on the plunder which their masters had left, and in a few weeks havoc was done, the French envoy told Lewis, which it would take years to repair. Meanwhile James sailed from France to Kinsale. His first work was to crush the Protestants who stood in arms in the north. Fifty thousand men had gathered to Tyrconnell's standard, and about half the number were sent against

Londonderry, where the bulk of the fugitives found shelter behind a weak wall, manned by a few old guns, and destitute even of a ditch. But the seven thousand desperate Englishmen behind the wall made up for its weakness. So fierce were their sallies, so rushing the repulse of his attack, that the King's general, Hamilton, at last turned the siege into a blockade. The Protestants died of hunger in the streets, and of the fever which comes of hunger, but the cry of the town was still "No Surrender." The siege had lasted a hundred and five days, and only two days' food remained in Londonderry, when on the 28th of July an English ship broke the boom across the river, and the besiegers suddenly withdrew. Their defeat was turned into a rout by the men of Enniskillen, who struggled through a bog to charge an Irish force of double their number at Newtown Butler, and drove horse and foot before them in a panic which soon spread through Hamilton's whole army. The routed soldiers fell back on Dublin, where James lay helpless in the hands of the frenzied Catholics. In the Parliament he had summoned every member returned was an Irishman and a Papist, and its one aim was the ruin of the English settlers. The Act of Settlement, on which all title to property rested, was at once repealed. Three thousand Protestants of name and fortune were massed together in the hugest Bill of attainder which the world has seen. In spite of the love which James professed for religious freedom, the Protestant clergy were driven from their parsonages, Fellows and scholars were turned out of Trinity College, and the French envoy, the Count of Avaux, dared even to propose a general massacre of the Protestants who still lingered in the districts which had submitted to James. To this credit the King shrank horror-struck from the proposal. "I cannot be so cruel," he said, "as to cut their throats while they live peaceably under my government." "Mercy to Protestants," was the cold reply, "is cruelty to Catholics."

Through the long agony of Londonderry, through the pro-
scription and bloodshed of the new Irish rule, William was forced
to look helplessly on. The best troops in the army which had been
mustered at Hounslow followed Marlborough to the Sambre; and
with the political embarrassments which grew up around the
government it was unable to spare a man of those who remained.
The great ends of the Revolution were indeed secured, even amidst
the confusion and intrigue which we shall have to describe, by the
common consent of all. On the great questions of civil liberty Whig
and Tory were now at one. The Declaration of Right was turned
into the Bill of Rights, and the passing of this measure in 1689
restored to the monarchy the character which it had lost under the
Tudors and the Stuarts. The right of the people through its repre-
sentatives to depose the King, to change the order of succession,
and to set on the throne whom they would, was now established.
All claim of Divine Right, or hereditary right independent of the
law, was formally put an end to by the election of William and

1689
to
1694

England
and the
Revolution

1689
to
1694

Mary. Since their day no English sovereign has been able to advance any claim to the crown save a claim which rested on a particular clause in a particular Act of Parliament. William, Mary, and Anne, were sovereigns simply by virtue of the Bill of Rights. George the First and his successors have been sovereigns solely by virtue of the Act of Settlement. An English monarch is now as much the creature of an Act of Parliament as the pettiest tax-gatherer in his realm. A limitation of the right of succession which expressed this parliamentary origin of the sovereign's right in the strongest possible way was found in the provision "that who-soever shall hereafter come to the possession of this crown shall join in communion with the Church of England as by law established." Nor was the older character of the kingship alone restored. The older constitution returned with it. Bitter experience had taught England the need of restoring to the Parliament its absolute power over taxation. The grant of revenue for life to the last two kings had been the secret of their anti-national policy, and the first act of the new legislature was to restrict the grant of the royal revenue to a term of four years. William was bitterly galled by the provision. "The gentlemen of England trusted King James," he said, "who was an enemy of their religion and their laws, and they will not trust me, by whom their religion and their laws have been preserved." But the only change brought about in the Parliament by this burst of royal anger was a resolve henceforth to make the vote of supplies an annual one, and this resolve has been adhered to ever since. A change of almost as great importance established the control of Parliament over the army. The hatred to a standing army which had begun under Cromwell had only deepened under James; but with the continental war the existence of an army was a necessity. As yet, however, it was a force which had no legal existence. The soldier was simply an ordinary subject; there were no legal means of punishing strictly military offences or of providing for military discipline: and the assumed power of billeting soldiers in private houses had been taken away by the law. The difficulty both of Parliament and the army was met by the Mutiny Act. The powers requisite for discipline in the army were conferred by Parliament on its officers, and provision was made for the pay of the force, but both pay and disciplinary powers were granted only for a few months. The Mutiny Act, like the grant of supplies, has remained annual ever since the Revolution; and as it is impossible for the State to exist without supplies, or for the army to exist without discipline and pay, the annual assembly of Parliament has become a matter of absolute necessity, and the greatest constitutional change which our history has witnessed was thus brought about in an indirect but perfectly efficient way. The dangers which experience had lately shown lay in the Parliament itself were met with far less skill. Under Charles, England had seen a Parliament, which had been returned in a moment of reaction, maintained without fresh election for eighteen years. A Triennial

bill, which limited the duration of a Parliament to three, was passed with little opposition, but fell before the dislike and veto of William. To counteract the influence which a king might obtain by crowding the Commons with officials proved a yet harder task. A Place Bill, which excluded all persons in the employment of the State from a seat in Parliament, was defeated, and wisely defeated, in the Lords. The modern course of excluding all minor officials, but of preserving the hold of Parliament over the great officers of State by admitting them into its body, seems as yet to have occurred to nobody. It is equally strange that while vindicating its right of parliamentary control over the public revenue and the army, the bill of Rights should have left by its silence the control of trade to the Crown. It was only a few years later, in the discussions on the charter granted to the East India Company, that the Houses jointly claimed and obtained the right of regulating English commerce.

The religious results of the Revolution were hardly less weighty than the political. In the common struggle against Catholicism, the Churchman and Nonconformist had found themselves, as we have seen, strangely at one; and schemes of Comprehension became suddenly popular. But with the fall of James the union of the two bodies abruptly ceased: and the establishment of a Presbyterian Church in Scotland, together with the "rabbling" of the Episcopalian clergy in its western shires, revived the old bitterness of the clergy towards the dissidents. The Convocation rejected the scheme of the Latitudinarians for such modifications of the Prayer-book as would render possible a return of the Nonconformists, and a Comprehension Bill which was introduced into Parliament failed to pass in spite of the King's strenuous support. William's attempt to admit Dissenters to civil equality by a repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts proved equally fruitless. Active persecution, however, had now become impossible, and the passing of a Toleration Act in 1689 practically secured freedom of worship. Whatever the religious effect of the failure of the Latitudinarian schemes may have been, its political effect has been of the highest value. At no time had the Church been so strong or so popular as at the Revolution, and the reconciliation of the Nonconformists would have doubled its strength. It is doubtful whether the disinclination to all political change which has characterized it during the last two hundred years would have been affected by such a change; but it is certain that the power of opposition which it has wielded could have been enormously increased. As it was, the Toleration Act established a group of religious bodies, whose religious opposition to the Church forced them to support the measures of progress which the Church opposed. With religious forces on the one side and on the other, England has escaped the great stumbling-block of the way of nations where the cause of religion has become identified with that of political reaction. A secession from within its own ranks weakened the Church still more. The doctrine of

1689
to
1694

Toleration
and
the
Church

1689
to
1694

Divine Right had a strong hold on the body of the clergy, though they had been driven from their other favourite doctrine of passive obedience, and the requirement of the oath of allegiance to the new sovereigns from all persons in public functions was resented as an intolerable wrong by almost every parson. Sancroft, the Archbishop of Canterbury, with a few prelates and a large number of the higher clergy, absolutely refused the oath, treated all who took it as schismatics, and on their deprivation by Act of Parliament regarded themselves and their adherents, who were known as Non-jurors, as the only members of the true Church of England. The bulk of the clergy bowed to necessity, but their bitterness against the new Government was fanned by the expulsion of the Non-jurors into a flame, and added to the difficulties which William had to encounter.

The
Act of
Grace

Not the least of his difficulties arose from the temper of his Parliaments. In 1689 the Convention declared itself a Parliament. In the Commons the bulk of the members were Whigs, and their first acts were to redress the wrongs which the Whig party had suffered during the last two reigns. The attainder of Lord Russell was reversed. The judgments against Sidney, Cornish, and Alice Lisle were annulled. In spite of the opinion of the judges that the sentence on Titus Oates had been against law, the Lords refused to reverse it, but even Oates received a pardon and a pension. The Whigs however wanted, not only the redress of wrongs, but the punishment of the wrong-doers. Whig and Tory had been united, indeed, by the tyranny of James; both parties had shared in the Revolution, and William had striven to prolong their union by joining the leaders of both in his first Ministry. He named the Tory Danby Lord President, made the Whig Shrewsbury Secretary of State, and gave the Privy Seal to Halifax, a trimmer between the one party and the other. But save in a moment of common oppression or common danger union was impossible. The Whigs clamoured for the punishment of Tories who had joined in the illegal acts of Charles and of James. They refused to pass the Bill of General Indemnity which William laid before them. William on the other hand was resolved that no bloodshed or proscription should follow the revolution which had placed him on the throne. His temper was averse to persecution; he had no great love for either of the battling parties; and above all he saw that internal strife would be fatal to the effective prosecution of the war. While the cares of his new throne were chaining him to England, the confederacy of which he was the guiding spirit was proving too slow and too loosely compacted to cope with the swift and resolute movements of France. The armies of Lewis had fallen back within their own borders, but only to turn fiercely at bay. The junction of the English and Dutch fleets failed to assure them the mastery of the seas. The English navy was paralysed by the corruption which prevailed in the public service, as well as by the sloth and incapacity of its commander. The services of Admiral Herbert at the Revolu-

ion had been rewarded by the earldom of Torrington and the command of the fleet; but his indolence suffered the seas to be swept by French privateers, and his want of seamanship was shown in an indecisive engagement with a French squadron in Bantry Bay. Meanwhile Lewis was straining every nerve to win the command of the Channel; the French dockyards were turning out ship after ship, and the galleys of the Mediterranean fleet were brought round to reinforce the fleet at Brest. A French victory off the English coast would have brought serious political danger, for the reaction of popular feeling which had begun in favour of James had been increased by the pressure of the war, by the taxation, by the expulsion of the Non-jurors and the discontent of the clergy, by the panic of the Tories at the spirit of vengeance which broke out among the triumphant Whigs, and above all by the presence of James in Ireland. A new party, that of the Jacobites or adherents of King James, was just forming; and it was feared that a Jacobite rising would follow the appearance of a French fleet on the coast. In such a state of affairs William judged rightly that to yield to the Whig thirst for vengeance would have been to ruin his cause. He dissolved the Parliament after sending down to it a general pardon for all political offences, under the title of an Act of Grace, and accepted the resignations of the more violent Whigs among his counsellors. Danby was entrusted with the chief administration of affairs; for Danby had power over the Tories, and in the new Parliament which was called in 1690 the bulk of the members proved Tories. William's aim in this sudden change of front was to secure a momentary lull in English faction which would suffer him to strike at the rebellion in Ireland. While James was King in Dublin it was hopeless to crush treason at home; and so urgent as the danger, so precious every moment in the present juncture of affairs, that William could trust no one to bring the work as sharply to an end as was needful save himself.

In the autumn of the year 1689 the Duke of Schomberg had been sent with a small force to Ulster, but his landing had only roused Ireland to a fresh enthusiasm. The ranks of the Irish army were led up at once, and James was able to face the duke at Drogheda with a force double that of his opponent. Schomberg, whose forces were all raw recruits whom it was hardly possible to trust at such odds in the field, entrenched himself at Dundalk, in a camp where pestilence soon swept off half his men, till winter parted the two armies. During the next six months James, whose treasury was utterly exhausted, strove to fill it by a coinage of brass money, while his soldiers subsisted by sheer plunder. William meanwhile was toiling hard on the other side of the Channel to bring the war to an end. Schomberg was strengthened during the winter with men and stores, and when the spring came his force reached thirty thousand men. Lewis, too, felt the importance of the coming struggle; and seven thousand picked Frenchmen, under the Count Lauzun, were despatched to reinforce the army of James. They

1689
to
1694

The
Battle
of the
Boyne

had hardly arrived when William himself landed at Carrickfergus, and pushed rapidly to the south. His columns soon caught sight of the Irish army, posted strongly behind the Boyne. "I am glad to see you, gentlemen," William cried with a burst of delight; "and if you escape me now the fault will be mine." Early next morning, the First of July, 1690, the whole English army plunged into the river. The Irish foot broke in a shameful panic, but the horse made so gallant a stand that Schomberg fell in repulsing its charge, and for a time the English centre was held in check. With the arrival of William, however, at the head of the left wing, all was over. James, who had looked helplessly on, fled to Dublin and took ship at Kinsale for France, while the capital threw open its gates to the conqueror. The cowardice of the Stuart sovereign moved the scorn even of his followers. "Change kings with us," an Irish officer replied to an Englishman who taunted him with the panic of the Boyne, "change kings with us, and we will fight you again." They did better in fighting without a king. The French, indeed, withdrew scornfully from the routed army as it stood at bay beneath the walls of Limerick. "Do you call these ramparts?" sneered Lauzun: "the English will need no cannon; they may batter them down with roasted apples." But twenty thousand men remained with Sarsfield, a brave and skilful officer who had seen service in England and abroad; and his daring surprise of the English ammunition train, his repulse of a desperate attempt to storm the town, and the approach of the winter, forced William to raise the siege. The turn of the war abroad recalled him to England, and he left his work to one who was quietly proving himself a master in the art of war. Lord Marlborough had been recalled from Flanders to command a division which had landed in the south of Ireland. Only a few days remained before winter would come to break off operations, but the few days were turned to good account. Cork, with five thousand men behind its walls, was taken in forty-eight hours. Kinsale a few days later shared the fate of Cork. Winter indeed left Connaught and the greater part of Munster in Irish hands; the French force remained untouched, and the coming of a new French general, St. Ruth, with arms and supplies, encouraged the insurgents. But the spring of 1691 had hardly opened when Ginkell, the new English general, by his seizure of Athlone forced on a battle with the combined French and Irish forces at Aughrim, in which St. Ruth fell on the field and his army was utterly broken. The defeat left Limerick alone in its revolt, and even Sarsfield bowed to the necessity of a surrender. Two treaties were drawn up between the Irish and English generals. By the first it was stipulated that the Catholics of Ireland should enjoy such privileges in the exercise of their religion as were consistent with law, or as they had enjoyed in the reign of Charles the Second. Both sides were, of course, well aware that such a treaty was merely waste paper, for Ginkell had no power to conclude it, nor had the Irish Lords Justices. The latter, indeed, only promised

do all they could to bring about its ratification by Parliament, and this ratification was never granted. By the military treaty, those of Sarsfield's soldiers who would were suffered to follow him to France; and ten thousand men, the whole of his force, chose exile rather than life in a land where all hope of national freedom was lost. When the wild cry of the women who stood watching their departure was hushed, the silence of death settled down upon the island. For a hundred years the country remained at peace, but the peace was a peace of despair. The most terrible legal tyranny under which a nation has ever groaned avenged the rising under Cromwell. The conquered people, in Swift's bitter words of contempt, became "hewers of wood and drawers of water" to their conquerors, but till the very eve of the French Revolution Ireland ceased to be a source of terror and anxiety to England.

Short as the struggle of Ireland had been, it had served Lewis well, for while William was busy at the Boyne a series of brilliant successes restored the fortunes of France. In Flanders the Duke of Luxembourg won the victory of Fleurus. In Italy Marshal Catinat defeated the Duke of Savoy. A success of even greater moment, the first victory which France was fated to win at sea, placed for an instant the very throne of William in peril. William never showed cooler courage than in quitting England to fight James in Ireland, a moment when the Jacobites were only looking for the appearance of a French fleet on the coast to rise in revolt. He was hardly on his way in fact when Tourville, the French admiral, put to sea with strict orders to fight. He was met by the English and Dutch fleet at Beachy Head, and the Dutch division at once engaged. Though utterly outnumbered, it fought stubbornly in hope of Herbert's aid; but Herbert, whether from cowardice or treason, looked idly on while his allies were crushed, and withdrew at nightfall to seek shelter in the Thames. The danger was as great as the name, for Tourville's victory left him master of the Channel, and his presence off the coast of Devon invited the Jacobites to revolt. But whatever the discontent of Tories and Non-jurors against William might be, all signs of it vanished with the landing of the French. The burning of Teignmouth by Tourville's sailors called the whole coast to arms; and the news of the Boyne put an end to all dreams of a rising in favour of James. The natural reaction against a cause which looked for foreign aid gave a new strength to the moment to William in England; but ill luck still hung round the Grand Alliance. So urgent was the need for his presence abroad that William left as we have seen his work in Ireland undone, and crossed in the spring of 1691 to Flanders. It was the first time since the days of Henry the Eighth that an English king had appeared on the Continent at the head of an English army. But the slowness of the allies again baffled William's hopes. He was forced to look on with a small army while a hundred thousand Frenchmen closed suddenly around Mons, the strongest fortress of the Netherlands, and made themselves master of it in the presence

1689
to
1694

The
Jacobite
Plots

July,
1690

1691

1689
to
1694

of Lewis. The humiliation was great, and for the moment all trust in William's fortune faded away. In England the blow was felt more heavily than elsewhere. The treason which had been crushed by the indignation at Tourville's descent woke up to a fresh life. Leading Tories, such as Lord Clarendon and Lord Dartmouth, opened communications with James; and some of the leading Whigs, with the Earl of Shrewsbury at their head, angered at what they regarded as William's ingratitude, followed them in their course. In Lord Marlborough's mind the state of affairs raised hopes of a double treason. His design was to bring about a revolt which would drive William from the throne without replacing James, and give the crown to his daughter Anne, whose affection for Marlborough's wife would place the real government of England in his hands. A yet greater danger lay in the treason of Admiral Russell, who had succeeded Torrington in command of the fleet. Russell's defection would have removed the one obstacle to a new attempt which James was resolved to make for the recovery of his throne, and which Lewis had been brought to support. In the beginning of 1692 an army of thirty thousand troops were quartered in Normandy in readiness for a descent on the English coast. Transports were provided for their passage, and Tourville was ordered to cover it with the French fleet at Brest. Though Russell had twice as many ships as his opponent, the belief in his purpose of betraying William's cause was so strong that Lewis ordered Tourville to engage the allied fleets at any disadvantage. But whatever Russell's intrigues may have meant, he was no Herbert. "Do not think I will let the French triumph over us in our own seas," he warned his Jacobite correspondents. "If I meet them I will fight them, even though King James were on board." When the two fleets met off the Norman coast his fierce attack proved Russell true to his word. Tourville's fifty vessels proved no match for the ninety ships of the allies, and after five hours of a brave struggle the French were forced to fly along the rocky coast of the Cotentin. Twenty-two of their vessels reached St. Malo; thirteen anchored with Tourville in the bays of Cherbourg and La Hogue; but their pursuers were soon upon them, and a bold attack of the English boats burnt ship after ship under the eyes of the French army. All dread of the invasion was at once at an end; and the throne of William was secured by the detection and suppression of the Jacobite conspiracy at home which the invasion was intended to support. But the overthrow of the Jacobite hopes was the least result of the victory of La Hogue. France ceased from that moment to exist as a great naval power; for though her fleet was soon recruited to its former strength, the confidence of her sailors was lost, and not even Tourville ventured again to tempt in battle the fortune of the seas. A new hope, too, broke on the Grand Alliance. The spell of French triumph was broken. The Duke of Luxembourg strove to restore the glory of the French arms by his victories over William in the two following years (1693-1694) at Steinkirk and

1692

eerwinden; but the battles were useless butcheries, in which the conquerors lost as many men as the conquered. From that moment France felt herself disheartened and exhausted by the vastness of her efforts. The public misery was extreme. "The country," Fénelon wrote frankly to Lewis, "is a vast hospital." For the first time in his long career of prosperity Lewis bent his pride to seek peace at the sacrifice of his conquests, and though the effort was vain one it told that the daring hopes of French ambition were at an end, and that the work of the Grand Alliance was practically done.

In outer seeming, the Revolution of 1688 had only transferred the sovereignty over England from James to William and Mary. In actual fact, it was transferring the sovereignty from the King to the House of Commons. From the moment when its sole right to tax the nation was established by the Bill of Rights, and when its own resolve settled the practice of granting none but annual supplies to the Crown, the House of Commons became the supreme power in the State. It was impossible permanently to suspend itsittings, or, in the long run, to oppose its will, when either course must end in leaving the Government penniless, in breaking up the army and navy, and in rendering the public service impossible. But though the constitutional change was complete, the machinery of government was far from having adapted itself to the new conditions of political life which such a change brought about. However powerful the will of the House of Commons might be,

it had no means of bringing its will directly to bear upon the conduct of public affairs. The Ministers who had charge of them were not its servants, but the servants of the Crown; it was from the King that they looked for direction, and to the King that they held themselves responsible. By impeachment or more indirect means the Commons could force a King to remove a Minister who contradicted their will; but they had no constitutional power to replace the fallen statesman by a Minister who would carry out their will. The result was the growth of a temper in the Lower House which drove William and his Ministers to despair. It became as corrupt, as jealous of power, as fickle in its resolves, as actious in spirit, as bodies always become whose consciousness of the possession of power is untempered by a corresponding consciousness of the practical difficulties or the moral responsibilities of the power which they possess. It grumbled at the ill-success of the war, at the suffering of the merchants, at the discontent of the churchmen; and it blamed the Crown and its Ministers for all at which it grumbled. But it was hard to find out what policy or measures it would have preferred. Its mood changed, as William bitterly complained, with every hour. It was, in fact, without the guidance of recognized leaders, without adequate information, and destitute of that organization out of which alone a definite policy can come. Nothing better proves the inborn political capacity of the English mind than that it should at once have found a simple

1689
to
1694

The
First
English
Ministry

and effective solution of such a difficulty as this. The credit of the solution belongs to a man whose political character was of the lowest type. Robert, Earl of Sunderland, had been a Minister in the later days of Charles the Second; and he had remained Minister through almost all the reign of James. He had held office at last only by compliance with the worst tyranny of his master, and by a feigned conversion to the Roman Catholic faith. But the ruin of James was no sooner certain than he had secured pardon and protection from William by the betrayal of the master to whom he had sacrificed his conscience and his honour. Since the Revolution, Sunderland had striven only to escape public observation in a country retirement, but at this crisis he came secretly forward to bring his unequalled sagacity to the aid of the King. His counsel was to recognize practically the new power of the Commons by choosing the Ministers of the Crown exclusively from among the members of the party which was strongest in the Lower House. As yet no Ministry, in the modern sense of the term, had existed. Each great officer of state, Treasurer, or Secretary, or Lord Privy Seal, had in theory been independent of his fellow-officers; each was the "King's servant" and responsible for the discharge of his special duties to the King alone. From time to time one Minister, like Clarendon, might tower above the rest and give a general direction to the whole course of government, but the predominance was merely personal and never permanent; and even in such a case there were colleagues who were ready to oppose or even impeach the statesman who overshadowed them. It was common for a King to choose or dismiss a single Minister without any communication with the rest; and so far from aiming at ministerial unity, even William had striven to reproduce in the Cabinet itself the balance of parties which prevailed outside it. Sunderland's plan aimed at replacing these independent Ministers by a homogeneous Ministry, chosen from the same party, representing the same sentiments, and bound together for common action by a sense of responsibility and loyalty to the party to which it belonged. Not only would such a plan secure a unity of administration which had been unknown till then, but it gave an organization to the House of Commons which it had never had before. The Ministers who were representatives of the majority of its members became the natural leaders of the House. Small factions were drawn together into the two great parties which supported or opposed the Ministry of the Crown. Above all it brought about in the simplest possible way the solution of the problem which had so long vexed both King and Commons. The new Ministers ceased in all but name to be the King's servants. They became simply an Executive Committee representing the will of the majority of the House of Commons, and capable of being easily set aside by it and replaced by a similar Committee whenever the balance of power shifted from one side of the House to the other.

Such was the origin of that system of representative government

which has gone on from Sunderland's day to our own. But though William showed his own political genius in understanding and adopting Sunderland's plan, it was only slowly and tentatively that he ventured to carry it out in practice. In spite of the temporary action Sunderland believed that the balance of political power was really on the side of the Whigs. Not only were they the natural representatives of the principles of the Revolution, and the supporters of the war, but they stood far above their opponents in parliamentary and administrative talent. At their head stood a group of statesmen, whose close union in thought and action gained them the name of the Junto. Russell, as yet the most prominent of these, was the victor of La Hogue; Somers was a young advocate who had sprung into fame by his defence of the Seven Bishops; Lord Wharton was known as the most dexterous and unscrupulous party managers; and Montague was fast making a reputation as the ablest of English financiers. In spite of such considerations, however, it is doubtful whether William would have thrown himself into the hands of a purely Whig Ministry but for the attitude which the Tories took towards the war. In spite of the exhaustion of France the war still languished and the allies still failed to win single victory. Meanwhile English trade was all but ruined by the French privateers, and the nation stood aghast at the growth of taxation. The Tories, always cold in their support of the Grand Alliance, now became eager for peace. The Whigs, on the other hand, remained resolute in their support of the war. William, in whose mind the contest with France was the first object, was thus given slowly to follow Sunderland's advice. In 1695 he dissolved Parliament, and the Whig tone of the new House of Commons enabled him to replace his Tory Ministers by the members of the Junto. Russell went to the Admiralty, Somers was named Lord Treasurer, Montague Chancellor of the Exchequer, Shrewsbury Secretary of State. The changes were gradually made, but they had hardly begun when their effect was felt. The House of Commons took a new tone. The Whig majority of its members, united and disciplined, moved quietly under the direction of their leaders, the new Ministers of the Crown. Great measures, financial and constitutional, passed rapidly through Parliament. The Triennial Bill became law. In spite of the efforts of the Lords, the Commons refused to renew the bill for the censorship of the press, and its liberty was no sooner thus recognized as legal (1695), than the recognition was at once followed by the appearance of a crowd of public prints. To meet the financial strain of the war Montague established the Bank of England (1694) by adopting the plan which Waterson, a Scotch adventurer, had brought forward for the creation of a National Bank. The subscribers to a loan of £1,200,000 were formed into a Company, with no exclusive privileges, and restricted by law from lending money to the Crown without consent of Parliament; but so great had been the growth of the national wealth that in ten days the list of subscribers was full. A new

 1689
to
1694

 The
Junto

1694

1695

1689 source of power revealed itself in the discovery of the resources
to afforded by the national credit; and the rapid growth of the
1694 National Debt gave a new security against the return of the Stuarts,
whose first work would have been the repudiation of it. With even
greater courage and hardly less originality Montague faced the
great difficulty of the debasement of the coinage and carried out
its reform. The power of the new administration, the evidence of
the public credit, gave strength to William abroad as at home. In
1695 the Alliance succeeded for the first time in winning a great
triumph over France in the capture of Namur. Even in the troubled
year which followed and amidst the distress created by the reform
of the currency, William was able to hold the French at bay. But
the war was fast drawing to a close. Lewis was simply fighting to
secure more favourable terms, and William, though he held that
"the only way of treating with France is with our swords in our
hands," was almost as eager as Lewis for a peace which would leave
him free to deal with a question which the health of the King of
Spain now brought every day closer, the question of the succession
to the Spanish throne. The obstacles which were thrown in the
way of an accommodation by Spain and the Empire were set aside
by a private negotiation between William and Lewis, and the year
1697 1697 saw the conclusion of the Peace of Ryswick. In spite of failure
and defeat in the field William's policy had won. The victories of
France remained barren in the face of a united Europe; and her
exhaustion forced her, for the first time since Richelieu's day, to
consent to a disadvantageous peace. The Empire was satisfied by
the withdrawal of France from every annexation, save that of
Strasbourg, which she had made since the Treaty of Nimeguen.
To Spain Lewis restored Luxembourg and all the conquests he had
made during the war in the Netherlands. The Duke of Lorraine
was replaced in his dominions. What was a far heavier humiliation
to Lewis personally was his abandonment of the Stuart cause and
his recognition of William as King of England. The Peace of
Ryswick was thus the final and decisive defeat of the conspiracy
which had gone on between Lewis and the Stuarts ever since the
Treaty of Dover, the conspiracy to turn England into a Roman
Catholic country and into a dependency of France.

SECTION IX.—MARLBOROUGH, 1698—1712

1698
to
1712

[*Authorities.*—Burnet's "Own Times" and Boyer's "Political State Great Britain" are important; the latter was expanded into a history Queen Anne. Swift's Works and Defoe's "History of the Union" are very valuable. For Marlborough, his Correspondence, and Coxe's life. For Bolingbroke, his Letters and Correspondence, and Macknight's life. For the general history of the reign, Stanhope's "Reign of Queen Anne"; Wyon's "History of Great Britain during the Reign of Queen Anne"; and Lecky's "History of England in the Eighteenth Century."]

What had bowed the pride of Lewis to the humiliating terms of the Peace of Ryswick was not so much the exhaustion of France as the need of preparing for a new and greater struggle. The death of the King of Spain, Charles the Second, was known to be at hand; and with him ended the male line of the Austrian princes, who for two hundred years had occupied the Spanish throne. How strangely vain had fallen from its high estate in Europe the wars of Lewis and abundantly shown, but so vast was the extent of its empire, so enormous the resources which still remained to it, that under a vigorous ruler men believed its old power would at once return. The sovereign was still master of some of the noblest provinces of the Old World and the New, of Spain itself, of the Milanese, of Naples and Sicily, of the Netherlands, of Southern America, of the noble islands of the Spanish Main. To add such a dominion as this to the dominion either of Lewis or of the Emperor would be to do at a blow the work of European independence which William had wrought; and it was with a view to prevent either of these results that William freed his hands by the Peace of Ryswick. At this moment the claimants of the Spanish succession were three: the Dauphin, a son of the Spanish King's elder sister; the Electoral Prince of Bavaria, a grandson of his younger sister; and the Emperor, who was a son of Charles's aunt. In strict law—if there had been any law really applicable to the matter—the claim of the Emperor was the stronger of the three; for the claim of the Dauphin was barred by an express renunciation of all right to the succession in his mother's marriage with Lewis XIV., a renunciation which had been ratified at the Treaty of the Pyrenees; and a similar renunciation barred the claim of the Bavarian candidate. The aim of the Emperor was more remote in blood, but it was barred by no renunciation at all. William however was as resolute in the interests of Europe to repulse the claim of the Emperor as to pulse that of Lewis; and it was the consciousness that the Austrian succession was inevitable if the war continued and Spain remained a member of the Grand Alliance, in arms against France and leagued with the Emperor, which made him suddenly conclude the Peace of Ryswick. Had England and Holland shared William's opinion he would have insisted on the succession of the Electoral Prince to the whole Spanish dominions. But both were weary of war. In England the peace was at once followed by the reduction

The
Spanish
Succession

1698
to
1712

1698

of the army at the demand of the House of Commons to ten thousand men; and a clamour had already begun for the disbanding even of these. It was necessary to bribe the two rival claimants to a waiver of their claims, and by the First Partition Treaty, concluded in 1698, between England, Holland, and France, the succession of the Electoral Prince was recognized on condition of the cession by Spain of its Italian possessions to his two rivals. The Milanese would thus pass to the Emperor, the Two Sicilies with the border province of Guipuscoa to France. But the arrangement was hardly concluded when the death of the Bavarian prince made the Treaty waste paper. Austria and France were left face to face, and a terrible struggle, in which the success of either would be equally fatal to the independence of Europe, seemed unavoidable. The peril was greater that the temper of England left William without the means of backing his policy by arms. The suffering which the war had caused to the merchant class and the pressure of the debt and taxation it entailed were waking every day a more bitter resentment in the people, and the general discontent avenged itself on William and the party who had backed his policy. The King's prodigal grants of crown lands to his Dutch favourites, his cold and sullen demeanour, his endeavour to maintain the standing army, robbed him of whatever popularity he still retained. The Whig Junto lost hold on the Commons. Montague was driven from his post, Somers was unscrupulously attacked, and even the boldest Whigs shrank from accepting office. William's earnest entreaty could not turn the Parliament from its resolve to send his Dutch guards out of the country, and to reduce the army from ten thousand men to seven. The navy, which had numbered forty thousand sailors during the war, was at the same time cut down to eight. How much William's hands were weakened by this peace-temper of England was shown by the Second Partition Treaty which was concluded in 1700 between the three powers. By this, in spite of the protests of the Emperor, who refused to join in the Treaty or to surrender his claim to the whole Spanish monarchy, Spain, the Netherlands, and the Indies were assigned to his second son the Archduke Charles of Austria. But the compensation granted to France was now increased. To the Two Sicilies was added the Duchy of Lorraine, whose Duke was transferred to the Milanese. If the Emperor still persisted in his refusal to come into the Treaty, his share was to pass to another unnamed prince, who was probably the Duke of Savoy.

1700

The
Second
Grand
Alliance

The Emperor still protested, but his protest was of little moment so long as Lewis and the two maritime powers held firmly together. Nor was the bitter resentment of Spain of more avail. The Spaniards cared little whether a French or an Austrian prince sat on the throne of Charles the Second, but their pride revolted against the dismemberment of the monarchy by the loss of its Italian dependencies. Even the miserable King shared the anger of his subjects, and a will wrested from him by the factions which wrangled

er his death-bed bequeathed the whole monarchy of Spain to a grandson of Lewis, the Duke of Anjou, the second son of the Dauphin. The Treaty of Partition was so recent, and the risk of repeating this bequest so great, that Lewis would hardly have allowed on it but for his belief that the temper of England must necessarily render William's opposition a fruitless one. Never in it had England been so averse from war. So strong was the sympathy to William's foreign policy that men openly approved what Lewis had done. Hardly anyone in England dreaded the cession of a boy who, French as he was, would as they believed not be turned into a Spaniard by the natural course of events. The succession of the Duke of Anjou was generally looked upon as better than the increase of power which France would have derived from the cessions of the last Treaty of Partition, cessions which would have turned the Mediterranean, it was said, into a French lake. "It grieves me to the heart," William wrote bitterly, "that almost everyone rejoices that France has preferred the will of the Treaty." Astonished and angered as he was at his rival's lack of faith, he had no means of punishing it. In 1701 the Duke of Anjou peaceably entered Madrid, and Lewis proudly boasted that henceforth there were no Pyrenees. The life-work of William seemed undone. He knew himself to be dying. His cough was incessant, his eyes sunk and dead, his frame so weak that he could hardly get into his coach. But never had he shown himself so great. His courage rose with every difficulty. His temper grew cooler and more serene with every insult. His large and clear-sighted intellect looked through the temporary embarrassments of French diplomacy and English faction to the great interests which would in the end determine the course of European politics. Abroad and at home seemed to go against him. For the moment he had no ally save Holland, for Spain was now united with Lewis, and the Elector of Bavaria, who held charge of the Spanish Netherlands and on whom William had counted, joined the French side and proclaimed the Duke of Anjou as King in Brussels. The attitude of Bavaria divided Germany and held the House of Austria in check. In England the new Parliament was crowded with Tories who were solute against war, and William was forced in 1701 to name a Tory Ministry with Lord Godolphin at its head, which pressed him to acknowledge the new King of Spain. As even Holland did this, William was forced to submit. He could only count on France to help him, and he did not count in vain. Bitter as the strife of Whig and Tory might be in England, there were two things on which Whig and Tory were agreed. Neither would suffer France to occupy the Netherlands. Neither would endure a French attack on the Protestant succession which the Revolution of 1688 had established. But the greed of Lewis blinded him to the need of moderation in this hour of good-luck. The Spanish garrisons in the Netherlands were weak, and in the name of his grandson he introduced French troops into town after town. The English Parliament

1688
to
1712

1701

1698
to
1712

at once acquiesced in William's demand for their withdrawal; but the demand was haughtily rejected. Holland, fearful of invasion as the French troops gathered on her frontier, appealed to England for aid, and the Tory party in the Parliament saw with helpless rage that they were silently drifting into war. They impeached the leading members of the Junto for their share in the Partition Treaties; they insulted William, and delayed the supplies. But outside the House of Commons the tide of national feeling rose as the designs of Lewis grew clearer and a great French fleet gathered in the Channel. Its aim was revealed by the disclosure of a fresh Jacobite Plot, the proofs of which were laid before Parliament. Even the House of Commons took fire. The fleet was raised to thirty thousand men, the army to ten thousand, and Kent sent up a remonstrance against the factious measures by which the Tories still struggled against the King's policy, and a prayer "that addresses might be turned into Bills of Supply." William was encouraged by these signs of a change of temper to despatch an English force to Holland, and to conclude a secret treaty with Holland and the Empire for the recovery of the Netherlands from France, and of the Sicilies and Milanese from Spain. But England at large was still clinging desperately to peace, when Lewis by a sudden act forced it into war. He had acknowledged William as King in the Peace of Ryswick, and pledged himself to oppose all attacks on his throne. He now entered the bed-chamber at St. Germain where James was breathing his last, and promised to acknowledge his son at his death as King of England, Scotland, and Ireland. The promise was in fact a declaration of war, and in a moment all England was at one in accepting the challenge. The issue Lewis had raised was no longer a matter of European politics, but the question whether the work of the Revolution should be undone, and whether Catholicism and despotism should be replaced on the throne of England by the arms of France. On such a question as this there was no difference between Tory and Whig. Not a word of protest had been uttered when the death of the last living child of the Princess Anne was followed in 1701 by the passing of an Act of Settlement which, setting aside not only the pretended Prince of Wales and a younger daughter of James the Second, but the Duchess of Savoy, a daughter of Henrietta of Orleans, and other claimants nearer in blood, as disqualified by their profession of the Catholic religion, vested the right to the crown in Sophia, Electress-Dowager of Hanover, a child of the Queen of Bohemia and a granddaughter of James the First, and the heirs of her body, being Protestants. The same national union showed itself in the King's welcome on his return from the Hague, where the conclusion of a new Grand Alliance between the Empire, Holland, and the United Provinces, had rewarded William's patience and skill. The Alliance was soon joined by Denmark, Sweden, the Palatinate, and the bulk of the German States. The Parliament which William summoned in 1702, though still Tory in the main, replied to

1702

stirring appeal by voting forty thousand men for the

1698

to

1712

Marl-
borough

ut the King's weakness was already too great to allow of his
ng the field; and he was forced to entrust the war in the
herlands to the one Englishman who had shown himself capable
great command. John Churchill, Earl of Marlborough, was
in 1650, the son of a Devonshire Cavalier, whose daughter
me at the Restoration mistress of the Duke of York. The
ne of Arabella did more perhaps than her father's loyalty to
for her brother a commission in the Royal Guards; and after
years' service abroad under Turenne the young captain became
nel of an English regiment which was retained in the service
rance. He had already shown some of the qualities of a great
ior, an unruffled courage, a bold and venturous temper held in
ck by a cool and serene judgment, a vigilance and capacity for
uring fatigue which never forsook him. In later years he was
wn to spend a whole day in reconnoitring, and at Blenheim he
ained on horseback for fifteen hours. But courage and skill in
s did less for Churchill on his return to the English court than
personal beauty. In the French camp he had been known as
e handsome Englishman;" and his manners were as winning
his person. Even in age his address was almost irresistible:
engrossed the graces," says Chesterfield; and his air never
ne indolent sweetness which won the favour of Lady Castle-
ne. A present of £5000 from the King's mistress laid the
idation of a fortune which grew rapidly to greatness, as the
lent forethought of the handsome young soldier hardened into
avarice of age. But it was to the Duke of York that Churchill
ed for advancement, and he earned it by the fidelity with
ch as a member of his household he clung to the Duke's fortunes
ng the dark days of the Plot. He followed James to Edinburgh
the Hague, and was raised to the peerage on his return and
arded with the colonelcy of the Royal Life Guards. The service
rendered his master after his accession by saving the Royal
y from a surprise at Sedgemoor would have been yet more
ndidly acknowledged but for the King's bigotry. In spite of
master's personal solicitations Churchill remained true to
testantism. But he knew James too well to count on further
our; and no sentiment of gratitude hindered him from corre-
ding with the Prince of Orange, and planning a mutiny in the
y gathered to oppose him which would have brought the King
risoner into the Prince's camp. His plot broke down, but his
ction proved fatal to the Royal cause; and the service which
had rendered to William, base as it was, was too priceless to
s its reward. Churchill became Earl of Marlborough; he was
at the head of a force during the Irish war, where his rapid
esses at once won William's regard; and he was given high
mand in the army of Flanders. But the treason which Marl-
ough had plotted against James was as nothing when compared

1698
to
1712

to the treason which he soon plotted against William. Great as was his greed of gold, he had married Sarah Jennings, a penniless beauty of Charles's court, in whom a violent and malignant temper was strangely combined with a power of winning and retaining love. Marlborough's affection for her ran like a thread of gold through the dark web of his career. In the midst of his marches and from the very battle-field he writes to his wife with the same passionate tenderness. The composure which no danger or hatred could ruffle broke down into almost womanish depression at the thought of her coldness or at any burst of her violent humour. He never left her without a pang. "I did for a great while with a perspective glass look upon the cliffs," he once wrote to her after setting out on a campaign, "in hopes that I might have had one sight of you." It was no wonder that the woman who inspired Marlborough with a love like this bound to her the weak and feeble nature of the Princess Anne. The two friends threw off the restraints of state, and addressed each other as "Mrs. Freeman" and "Mrs. Morley." It was through the influence of his wife that Churchill induced Anne to desert her father at the Revolution; and it was on the same influence that his ambition counted in its designs against William. His plan was simply to drive the King from the throne by backing the Tories in their opposition to the war as well as by stirring to frenzy the English hatred of foreigners, and to seat Anne in his place. The discovery of his designs roused the King to a burst of unusual resentment. "Were I and my Lord Marlborough private persons," William exclaimed, "the sword would have to settle between us." As it was, he could only strip the Earl of his offices and command, and drive his wife from St. James's. Anne followed her favourite, and the court of the Princess became the centre of the Tory opposition: while Marlborough opened a correspondence with James, and went far beyond his fellow-traitors in baseness by revealing to him, and through him to France, the war-projects of the English Cabinet.

Marl-
borough
and the
Grand
Alliance

The death of Mary forced William to recall Anne, who had now become his successor; and with Anne the Marlboroughs returned to court. The King could not bend himself to trust the Earl again; but as death drew near he saw in him the one man whose splendid talents fitted him, in spite of the baseness and treason of his life, to rule England and direct the Grand Alliance in his stead. He put Marlborough at the head of the army in Flanders, but the Earl had only just taken the command when, on the 20th of February, 1702, a fall from his horse proved fatal to the broken frame of the King. "There was a time when I should have been glad to have been delivered out of my troubles," the dying man whispered to Portland, "but I own I see another scene, and could wish to live a little longer." He knew, however, that the wish was vain, and commended Marlborough to Anne as the fittest person to lead her armies and guide her counsels. Anne's zeal needed no quickening. Three days after her accession on the 8th of March, the Earl was

1698
to
1712

ned Captain-General of the English forces at home and abroad, entrusted with the entire direction of the war. His supremacy at home affairs was secured by the elevation of Lord Godolphin, skilled financier, and a close friend of Marlborough's, to the post of Lord Treasurer. The Queen's affection for his wife ensured him support of the Crown at a moment when Anne's personal popularity gave the Crown a new weight with the nation. In England, indeed, party feeling for the moment died away. The Tories were won over to the war now that it was waged by a Tory general, and the Whigs were ready to back even a Tory general waging a Whig war. Abroad William's death shook the Grand Alliance to its base; and even Holland wavered in dread of being overtaken by England in the coming struggle. But the decision of Marlborough soon did away with this distrust. Anne was made to share from the throne her resolve to pursue with energy the policy of her predecessor. The Tory Parliament was brought to action vigorous measures for the prosecution of the war. The general hastened to the Hague, received the command of the Dutch as well as of the English forces, and drew the German powers into the Confederacy with a skill and adroitness which even William might have envied. Never was greatness more quickly recognized than in the case of Marlborough. In a few months he was regarded by all as the guiding spirit of the Alliance, and nations whose jealousy had worn out the patience of William yielded without a struggle to the counsels of his successor. The temper, indeed, of Marlborough fitted him in an especial way to be the head of a great confederacy. Like William, he owed little of his power to any early training. The trace of his neglected education was seen to the last in his reluctance to write. "Of all things," he said to his wife, "I do not love writing." To pen a despatch seemed was a far greater trouble to him than to plan a campaign. His nature had given him qualities which in other men spring chiefly from culture. His capacity for business was immense. During the next ten years he assumed the general direction of the war in Flanders and in Spain. He managed every negotiation with the courts of the allies. He watched over the shifting phases of foreign politics. He had to cross the Channel to win over Anne to change in the Cabinet, or to hurry to Berlin to secure the due contingent of Electoral troops from Brandenburg. At the same time he was reconciling the Emperor with the Protestants of Hungary, stirring the Calvinists of the Cevennes into revolt, managing the affairs of Portugal, and providing for the protection of the Duke of Savoy. But his air showed no trace of fatigue or of weariness or vexation. He retained to the last the indolent grace of youth. His natural dignity was never ruffled by an outbreak of anger. Amidst the storm of battle men saw him, "without fear or danger or in the least hurry, giving his orders with all the calmness imaginable." In the cabinet he was as cool as on the battle-field. He met with the same equable serenity the pettiness

of the German princes, the phlegm of the Dutch, the ignorant opposition of his officers, the libels of his political opponents. There was a touch of irony in the simple expedients by which he sometimes solved problems which had baffled Cabinets. The King of Prussia was one of the most vexatious among the allies, but all difficulty with him ceased when Marlborough rose at a state banquet and handed to him a napkin. Churchill's composure rested partly indeed on a pride which could not stoop to bare the real self within to the eyes of meaner men. In the bitter moments before his fall he bade Godolphin burn some querulous letters which the persecution of his opponents had wrung from him. "My desire is that the world may continue in their error of thinking me a happy man, for I think it better to be envied than pitied." But in great measure it sprang from the purely intellectual temper of his mind. His passion for his wife was the one sentiment which tinged the colourless light in which his understanding moved. In all else he was without love or hate, he knew neither doubt nor regret. In private life he was a humane and compassionate man; but if his position required it he could betray Englishmen to death in his negotiations with St. Germain, or lead his army to a butchery such as that of Malplaquet. Of honour or the finer sentiments of mankind he knew nothing; and he turned without a shock from guiding Europe and winning great victories to heap up a matchless fortune by speculation and greed. He is perhaps the only instance of a man of real greatness who loved money for money's sake. The passions which stirred the men around him, whether noble or ignoble, were to him simply elements in an intellectual problem which had to be solved by patience. "Patience will overcome all things," he writes again and again. "As I think most things are governed by destiny, having done all things we should submit with patience."

Marl-
borough
and the
War

As a statesman the high qualities of Marlborough were owned by his bitterest foes. "Over the Confederacy," says Bolingbroke, "he, a new, a private man, acquired by merit and management a more decided influence than high birth, confirmed authority, and even the crown of Great Britain, had given to King William." But great as he was in the council, he was even greater in the field. He stands alone amongst the masters of the art of war as a captain whose victories began at an age when the work of most men is done. Though he served as a young officer under Turenne and for a few months in Ireland and the Netherlands, he had held no great command till he took the field in Flanders at the age of fifty-two. He stands alone, too, in his unbroken good fortune. Voltaire notes that he never besieged a fortress which he did not take, or fought a battle which he did not win. His difficulties came not from the enemy, but from the ignorance and timidity of his own allies. He was never defeated in the field, but victory after victory was snatched from him by the incapacity of his officers or the stubbornness of the Dutch. What startled the cautious strategists of his

1698
to
1712

was the vigour and audacity of his plans. Old as he was, Marlborough's designs had from the first all the dash and boldness of youth. On taking the field in 1702 he at once resolved to force battle in the heart of Brabant. The plan was foiled by the idly of the Dutch deputies, but his resolute advance across Meuse drew the French forces from that river and enabled him to reduce fortress after fortress in a series of sieges. The surrender of Maastricht closed a campaign which cut off the French from the Lower Rhine and freed Holland from all danger of an invasion. The successes of Marlborough had been brought into bolder relief by the fortunes of the war in other quarters. In Italy Prince Eugene of Savoy showed his powers by a surprise of the French army at Monmouth, but no real successes had been won. An English descent on the Spanish coast ended in failure. In Germany the Bavarians aided the French, and the united armies defeated the forces of the Empire. It was in this quarter that Lewis resolved to push his fortunes. In the spring of 1703 a fresh army under Marshal Villars in relieved the Elector from the pressure of the Imperial armies,

only a strife which arose between the two commanders hindered the joint armies from marching on Vienna. Meanwhile the timidity of the Dutch deputies served Lewis well in the Low Countries. Marlborough had been created Duke, and munificently rewarded for his services in the previous year, but his hopes in this second campaign were foiled by the deputies of the States-General. One as his temper was, it broke down before their refusal to cooperate in an attack on Antwerp and French Flanders; and the efforts of Godolphin and of the pensionary Heinsius alone induced him to withdraw his offer of resignation. But in spite of victories on the Danube, the blunders of his adversaries on the Rhine, and the sudden aid of an insurrection which broke out in Hungary, the difficulties of Lewis were hourly increasing. The accession of Savoy to the Grand Alliance threatened his armies in Italy with destruction. That of Portugal gave the allies a base of operations against Spain. His energy however rose with the pressure, and while the Duke of Berwick, a natural son of James the Second, was despatched against Portugal, three small armies closed round Savoy. The efforts of the French troops joined the army of Bavaria on the Danube, for the bold plan of Lewis was to decide the fortunes of the war by a victory which would wrest peace from the Empire under the walls of Vienna.

The master-stroke of Lewis roused Marlborough at the opening of 1704 to a master-stroke in return; but the secrecy and boldness of the Duke's plans deceived both his enemies and his allies. The French army in Flanders saw in his march upon Maintz only a transfer of the war into Elsass. The Dutch were lured into suffering their troops to be drawn as far from Flanders as Coblenz by the proposals of a campaign on the Moselle. It was only when Marlborough crossed the Neckar and struck through the heart of Germany that many for the Danube that the true aim of his operations was

Blenheim

revealed. After struggling through the hill country of Würtemberg, he joined the Imperial army under the Prince of Baden, stormed the heights of Donauwörth, crossed the Danube and the Lech, and penetrated into the heart of Bavaria. The crisis drew the two armies which were facing one another on the Upper Rhine to the scene. The arrival of Marshal Tallard with thirty thousand French troops saved the Elector of Bavaria for the moment from the need of submission; but the junction of his opponent, Prince Eugene, with Marlborough raised the contending forces again to an equality, and after a few marches the armies met on the north bank of the Danube, near the little town of Höchstädt and the village of Blindheim or Blenheim, which have given their names to the battle. In one respect the struggle which followed stands almost unrivalled in history, for the whole of the Teutonic race was represented in the strange medley of Englishmen, Dutchmen, Hanoverians, Danes, Würtembergers and Austrians who followed Marlborough and Eugene. The French and Bavarians, who numbered like their opponents some fifty thousand men, lay behind a little stream which ran through swampy ground to the Danube. The position was a strong one, for its front was covered by the swamp, its right by the Danube, its left by the hill-country in which the stream rose, and Tallard had not only entrenched himself, but was far superior to his rival in artillery. But for once Marlborough's hands were free. "I have great reason," he wrote calmly home, "to hope that everything will go well, for I have the pleasure to find all the officers willing to obey without knowing any other reason than that it is my desire, which is very different from what it was in Flanders, where I was obliged to have the consent of a council of war for everything I undertook." So formidable were the obstacles, however, that though the allies were in motion at sunrise on the 13th of August, it was not till midday that Eugene, who commanded on the right, succeeded in crossing the stream. The English foot at once forded it on the left and attacked the village of Blindheim in which the bulk of the French infantry were entrenched, but after a furious struggle the attack was repulsed, while as gallant a resistance at the other end of the line held Eugene in check. The centre, however, which the French believed to be unassailable, had been chosen by Marlborough for the chief point of attack, and by making an artificial road across the morass he was at last enabled to throw his eight thousand horsemen on the French horse which lay covered by it. Two desperate charges which the Duke headed in person decided the day. The French centre was flung back on the Danube and forced to surrender. Their left fell back in confusion on Höchstädt: their right, cooped up in Blindheim and cut off from retreat, became prisoners of war. Of the defeated army only twenty thousand escaped. Twelve thousand were slain, fourteen thousand were captured. Germany was finally freed from the French; and Marlborough, who followed the wreck of the French host in its flight to Elsass, soon made him-

self master of the Lower Moselle. But the loss of France could not be measured by men or fortresses. A hundred victories since Rocroi had taught the world to regard the French army as invincible, when Blenheim and the surrender of the flower of the French soldiery broke the spell. From that moment the terror of victory passed to the side of the allies, and "Malbrook" became a name of fear to every child in France.

1698
to
1712

In England itself the victory of Blenheim aided to bring about a great change in the political aspect of affairs. With the progress of the struggle the Tory party had slowly drifted back again into its old antipathy to a "Whig war." Marlborough strove to bind them to his policy by supporting in 1702 and 1703 a bill against occasional conformity, which excluded the Nonconformists yet more rigidly from all municipal rights, and by allowing the Queen to set aside the tenths and first-fruits hitherto paid by the clergy to the Crown as a fund for the augmentation of small benefices. The fund still bears the name of Queen Anne's Bounty. But the bill against occasional conformity was steadily resisted by the Lords, and Marlborough's efforts to bend the Tory Ministers to a support of the war were every day more fruitless. The higher Tories with Lord Nottingham at their head, who had thrown every obstacle they could in the way of its continuance, at last quitted office in 1704, and Marlborough replaced them by Tories of a more moderate stamp who were still in favour of the war: by Robert Harley, who became Secretary of State, and Henry St. John, a man of splendid talents, who was named Secretary at War. The Duke's march into Germany embittered the political strife. The Tories and Jacobites threatened, if Marlborough failed, to bring his head to the block, and only the victory of Blenheim saved him from political ruin. slowly and against his will the Duke drifted from his own party to the party which really backed his policy. He availed himself of the national triumph over Blenheim to dissolve Parliament; the elections of 1705, as he hoped, returned a majority in favour of the war, and the efforts of Marlborough brought about a coalition between the Whig Junto and the moderate Tories who still clung to him, which foiled the bitter attacks of the peace party. The support of the Whigs was purchased by making a Whig, William Cowper, Lord Keeper, and sending Lord Sunderland as Envoy to Vienna Marlborough at last felt secure at home. But he had to bear disappointment abroad. His plan of attack along the line of the Moselle was defeated by the refusal of the Imperial army to join him. When he entered the French lines across the Dyle, the Dutch generals withdrew their troops; and his proposal to attack the Duke of Villeroy in the field of Waterloo was rejected in full council of war by the deputies of the States with cries of "murder" and "massacre." Even Marlborough's composure broke into bitterness at the blow. "Had I had the same power I had last year," he wrote home, "I could have won a greater victory than that of Blenheim." On his complaint the States recalled their

Ramillies

in 1705

1698
to
1712

commissaries, but the year was lost; nor had greater results been brought about in Italy or on the Rhine. The spirits of the allies were only sustained by the romantic exploits of Lord Peterborough in Spain. Profligate, unprincipled, flighty as he was, Peterborough had a genius for war, and his seizure of Barcelona with a handful of men, his recognition of the old liberties of Arragon, roused that province to support the cause of the second son of the Emperor, who had been acknowledged as King of Spain by the allies under the title of Charles the Third. Catalonia and Valentia soon joined Arragon in declaring for Charles: while Marlborough spent the winter of 1705 in negotiations at Vienna, Berlin, Hanover, and the Hague, and in preparations for the coming campaign. Eager for freedom of action and sick of the Imperial generals as of the Dutch, he planned a march over the Alps and a campaign in Italy; and though his designs were defeated by the opposition of the allies, he found himself unfettered when he again appeared in Flanders in 1706. Villeroy was as eager as Marlborough for an engagement; and the two armies met on the 23rd of May at the village of Ramillies on the undulating plain which forms the highest ground in Brabant. The French were drawn up in a wide curve with morasses covering their front. After a feint on their left, Marlborough flung himself on their right wing at Ramillies, crushed it in a brilliant charge that he led in person, and swept along their whole line till it broke in a rout which only ended beneath the walls of Louvain. In an hour and a half the French had lost fifteen thousand men, their baggage, and their guns, and the line of the Scheldt, Brussels, Antwerp and Bruges were the prize of the victors. It only needed the four successful sieges which followed the battle of Ramillies to complete the deliverance of Flanders.

The
Union

The year which witnessed the victory of Ramillies remains yet more memorable as the year which witnessed the final Union of England with Scotland. As the undoing of the earlier union had been the first work of the Government of the Restoration, its revival was one of the first aims of the Government which followed the Revolution. But the project was long held in check by religious and commercial jealousies. Scotland refused to bear any part of the English debt. England would not yield any share in her monopoly of trade with the Colonies. The English Churchmen longed for a restoration of Episcopacy north of the border, while the Scotch Presbyterians would not hear even of the legal toleration of Episcopalians. In 1703, however, the Act of Security which passed through the Scotch Parliament at last brought home to English statesmen the dangers of further delay. In dealing with this measure the Scotch Whigs, who cared only for the independence of their country, joined hand in hand with the Scotch Jacobites, who looked only to the interests of the Pretender. The Jacobites excluded from the Act the name of the Princess Sophia; the Whigs introduced a provision that no sovereign of England should be recognized as sovereign of Scotland save upon security given to the

1698
to
1712

religion, freedom, and trade of the Scottish people. Great as the danger arising from such a measure undoubtedly was, for it pointed to a recognition of the Pretender in Scotland on the Queen's death, and such a recognition meant war between Scotland and England, it was only after three years' delay that the wisdom and resolution of Lord Somers brought the question to an issue. The Scotch proposals of a federative rather than a legislative union were set aside by his firmness; the commercial jealousies of the English traders were put by; and the Act of Union as finally passed in 1707 provided that the two kingdoms should be united into one under the name of Great Britain, and that the succession to the crown of this United Kingdom should be ruled by the provisions of the English Act of Settlement. The Scotch Church and the Scotch Law were left untouched: but all rights of trade were thrown open, and a uniform system of coinage adopted. A single Parliament was henceforth to represent the United Kingdom, and for this purpose forty-five Scotch members were added to the five hundred and thirteen English members of the House of Commons, and sixteen representative peers to the one hundred and eight who formed the English House of Lords. In Scotland the opposition was bitter and almost universal. The terror of the Presbyterians indeed was met by an Act of Security which became part of the Treaty of Union, and which required an oath to support the Presbyterian Church from every sovereign on his accession. But no securities could satisfy the enthusiastic patriots or the fanatical Cameronians. The Jacobites sought troops from France and plotted a Stuart restoration. The nationalists talked of seceding from the Assembly which voted for the Union, and of establishing a rival Parliament. In the end, however, good sense and the loyalty of the trading classes to the cause of the Protestant succession won their way. The measure was adopted by the Scotch Parliament, and the Treaty of Union became in 1707 a legislative Act to which Anne gave her assent in noble words. "I desire," said the Queen, "and expect from my subjects of both nations that from henceforth they act with all possible respect and kindness to one another, that so it may appear to all the world they have hearts disposed to become one people." Time has more than answered these hopes. The two nations whom the Union brought together have ever since remained one. England gained in the removal of a constant danger of treason and war. To Scotland the Union opened up new avenues of wealth which the energy of its people turned to wonderful account. The farms of Lothian have become models of agricultural skill. A fishing town on the Clyde has grown into the rich and populous Glasgow. Peace and culture have changed the wild clansmen of the Highlands into herdsmen and farmers. Nor was the change followed by any loss of national spirit. The world has hardly seen a mightier and more rapid development of national energy than that of Scotland after the Union. All that passed away was the jealousy which had parted since the days of Edward the First two

1698
to
1712

peoples whom a common blood and common speech proclaimed to be one. The Union between Scotland and England has been real and stable simply because it was the legislative acknowledgment and enforcement of a national fact.

Marl-
borough
and the
Whigs

With the defeat of Ramillies the fortunes of France reached their lowest ebb. The loss of Flanders was followed by the loss of Italy after a victory by which Eugene relieved Turin; and not only did Peterborough hold his ground in Spain, but Charles the Third with an army of English and Portuguese entered Madrid. Marlborough was at the height of his renown. Ramillies gave him strength enough to force Anne, in spite of her hatred of the Whigs, to fulfil his compact with them by admitting Lord Sunderland, the bitterest leader of their party, to office. But the system of political balance which he had maintained till now was fast breaking down. Constitutionally, Marlborough's was the last attempt to govern England on other terms than those of party government, and the union of parties to which he had clung ever since his severance from the extreme Tories soon became impossible. The growing opposition of the Tories to the war threw the Duke more and more on the support of the Whigs, and the Whigs sold their support dearly. Sunderland was resolved to drive the moderate Tories from the Administration in spite of Marlborough's desire to retain them. "England," the Duke wrote hotly, "will not be ruined because a few men are not pleased," but the opposition of the Tories to the war left him helpless in the hands of the only party who steadily supported it. A factious union of the Whigs with their opponents roused Marlborough to a burst of unusual passion in Parliament, but it effected its end by convincing him of the impossibility of further resistance. The resistance of the Queen indeed was stubborn and bitter. Anne was at heart a Tory, and her old trust in Marlborough died with his acceptance of the Whig demands. It was only by the threat of resignation that he had forced her to admit Sunderland to office. The violent outbreak of temper with which the Duchess enforced her husband's will changed the Queen's friendship for her into a bitter resentment. Marlborough however was forced to increase this resentment by fresh compliances with the Whig demands, by removing Peterborough from his command as a Tory general, and by wresting from Anne her consent in 1708 to the dismissal of Harley and St. John from office, and the admission of Lord Somers and Wharton into the Ministry. Somers became President of the Council, Wharton Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and the Whig victory was complete. Meanwhile, the great struggle abroad was going on, with striking alternations of success. France rose with singular rapidity from the crushing blow of Ramillies. Spain was recovered for Philip by the victory of Marshal Berwick at Almanza. Villars won fresh triumphs on the Rhine, and Eugene, who had penetrated into Provence, was driven back into Italy. In Flanders, the plans of Marlborough were foiled by the strategy of the Duke of Vendôme and by the reluctance of the Dutch, who were now

wavering towards peace. In the campaign of 1708 however, Vendôme, though superior in force, was attacked and defeated at Oudenarde, and though Marlborough was hindered from striking at the heart of France by the timidity of the English and Dutch statesmen, he reduced Lille, the strongest of the frontier fortresses, in the face of an army of relief which numbered a hundred thousand men. The pride of Lewis was at last broken by defeat and by the terrible suffering of France. He offered terms of peace which yielded all that the allies had fought for. He consented to withdraw his aid from Philip of Spain, to give up ten Flemish fortresses to the Dutch, and to surrender to the Empire all that France had gained since the treaty of Westphalia. He offered to acknowledge Anne, to banish the Pretender from his dominions, and to demolish the fortifications of Dunkirk, a port hateful to England as the home of the French privateers.

1698
to
1712
—
1708

To Marlborough peace now seemed secure, but in spite of his counsels, the allies and the Whig Ministers in England demanded that Lewis should with his own troops compel his grandson to give up the crown of Spain. "If I must wage war," replied the King, "I had rather wage it against my enemies than against my children." At the opening of the campaign of 1709 he appealed to France, and France, exhausted as it was, answered nobly to his appeal. The terrible slaughter which bears the name of the battle of Malplaquet showed a new temper in the French soldiery. Starving as they were, they flung away their rations in their eagerness for the fight, and fell back at its close in serried masses that no efforts of Marlborough could break. They had lost twelve thousand men, but they had inflicted on the allies a loss of double that number. A "deluge of blood" such as that of Malplaquet increased the growing weariness of the war, and the rejection of the French offers was unjustly attributed to a desire on the part of Marlborough of lengthening out a contest which brought him profit and power. The expulsion of Harley and St. John from the ministry had given the Tories leaders of a more vigorous stamp, and St. John brought into play a new engine of political attack whose powers soon made themselves felt. In the *Examiner* and in a crowd of pamphlets and periodicals which followed in its train, the humour of Prior, the bitter irony of Swift, and St. John's own brilliant sophistry spent themselves on the abuse of the war and of its general. "Six millions of supplies and almost fifty millions of debt!" Swift wrote bitterly, "The High Allies have been the ruin of us!" Marlborough was ridiculed and reviled, he was accused of insolence, cruelty and ambition, of corruption and greed. Even his courage was called in question. A sudden storm of popular passion showed the way in which public opinion responded to these efforts. A High Church divine, Dr. Sacheverell, maintained the doctrine of non-resistance in a sermon at St. Paul's with a boldness which deserved prosecution; but in spite of the warning of Marlborough and of Somers the Whig Ministers resolved on his

England
and the
War

1698
to
1712

impeachment. His trial in 1710 at once widened into a great party struggle, and the popular enthusiasm in Sacheverell's favour showed the gathering hatred of the Whigs and the war. The most eminent of the Tory Churchmen stood by his side at the bar, crowds escorted him to the court and back again, while the streets rang with cries of "The Church and Dr. Sacheverell." A small majority of the peers found him guilty, but the light sentence they inflicted was in effect an acquittal, and bonfires and illuminations over the whole country welcomed it as a Tory triumph.

Fall of
Marl-
borough

The turn of popular feeling freed Anne at once from the pressure beneath which she had bent: and the skill of Harley, whose cousin, Mrs. Masham, had succeeded the Duchess of Marlborough in the Queen's favour, was employed in bringing about the fall both of Marlborough and the Whig Ministers by playing the one off against the other. The Whigs, who knew the Duke's alliance with them had simply been forced on him by the war, and were persuaded that the Queen had no aim but to humble him, looked coolly on at the dismissal of his son-in-law, Sunderland, and his friend, Godolphin. Marlborough, who leaned towards a reconciliation with his old party, looked on in return while Anne dismissed the Whig Ministers in the autumn of 1710 and appointed a Tory Ministry in their place with Harley and St. John at its head. In the face of these changes, however, the Duke did not dare to encounter the risks of any decisive enterprise; and his reduction of a few sea-board towns failed to win back English feeling to the continuance of so costly a struggle. The return of a Tory House of Commons sealed his fate. His wife was dismissed from court. A masterly plan for a march into the heart of France in the opening of 1711 was foiled by the withdrawal of a part of his forces, and the negotiations which had for some time been conducted between the French and English Ministers without his knowledge marched rapidly to a close. The sense of approaching ruin forced Marlborough at last to break with the Tory Ministry, and his efforts induced the House of Lords to denounce the contemplated peace; but the support of the Commons and the Queen, and the general hatred of the war among the people, enabled Harley to ride down all resistance. At the opening of 1712 the Whig majority in the House of Lords was swamped by the creation of twelve Tory peers. Marlborough was dismissed from his command, charged with peculation, and condemned as guilty by a vote of the House of Commons. He at once withdrew from England, and with his withdrawal all opposition to the peace was at an end.

As to the claim to the Spanish throne, Louis XIV. contended that his wife's renunciation was invalidated by the non-payment of her dower and the absence of ratification by the Cortes. The renunciation which was held to bar the claim of the Electoral Prince of Bavaria was merely private and invalid in Spanish law.

SECTION X.—WALPOLE, 1712—1742

1712
to
1742

[*Authorities.*—Coxe's "Memoirs of Sir R. Walpole" is the standard work on Walpole. Other works of importance are Horace Walpole's "Memoirs"; Hervey's "Memoirs"; Bolingbroke's Works, especially the "Patriot King" and the "Letter to Sir William Wyndham"; Swift's Works; and Horace Walpole's Letters. The best modern history of the period is Lecky, "History of England in the Eighteenth Century."]

The struggle of the House of Lords under Marlborough's guidance against Harley and the Peace marks the close of the constitutional evolution which had been silently going on since the Restoration of the Stuarts. The defeat of the Peers and the fall of Marlborough which followed it announced that the transfer of political power to the House of Commons was complete. The machinery by which Sunderland had enabled it to direct the actual government of the country had been strengthened by the failure of Marlborough to restore the older system of administration: and the Ministers of the Crown have remained ever since an Executive Committee whose work is to carry out the will of the majority of its members. A recognition of this great change was seen in the series of "Great Commons" who from this time became the rulers of England. The influence of political tradition, of wealth, and of the administrative training which their position often secures them, has at all times given places in the Ministry to members of the House of Lords, and a peer has sometimes figured as its nominal head. But the more natural arrangement has been the more common one; and all the greater statesmen who have guided the fortunes of England since Harley's day have been found in the Commons. Of these Great Commons Robert Walpole was the first. Born in 1676, he entered Parliament two years before William's death as a young Norfolk landowner of fair fortune, with the tastes and air of the class from which he sprang. His big square figure, his vulgar good-humoured face were those of a common country squire. And in Walpole the squire underlay the statesman to the last. He was ignorant of books, he "loved neither writing nor reading," and if he had a taste for art, his real love was for the table, the bottle, and the chase. He rode as hard as he drank. Even in moments of political peril, the first despatch he would open was the letter from his gamekeeper. There was the temper of the Norfolk fox-hunter in the "doggedness" which Marlborough noted as his characteristic, in the burly self-confidence which declared "If I had not been Prime Minister I should have been Archbishop of Canterbury," in the stubborn courage which conquered the awkwardness of his earlier efforts to speak or met single-handed at the last the bitter attacks of a host of enemies, and above all in the genial good-humour which became with him a new force in politics. Walpole was the first Minister—it has been finely said—who gave our government that character of lenity which it has

since generally deserved." No man was ever more fiercely attacked by speakers and writers, but he brought in no "gagging Act" for the press; and though the lives of most of his assailants were in his hands through their intrigues with the Pretender, he made no use of his power over them. Where his country breeding showed itself most, however, was in the shrewd, narrow, honest character of his mind. He saw very clearly, but he could not see far, and he would not believe what he could not see. He was thoroughly straightforward and true to his own convictions, so far as they went. "Robin and I are two honest men," the Jacobite Shippen owned in later years, when contrasting him with his factious opponents: "he is for King George, and I am for King James; but those men with long cravats only desire place, either under King George or King James." He saw the value of the political results which the Revolution had won, and he carried out his "Revolution principles" with a rare fidelity through years of unquestioned power. But his prosaic good sense turned sceptically away from the poetic and passionate sides of human feeling. Appeals to the loftier or purer motives of action he laughed at as "school-boy flights." For young members who talked of public virtue or patriotism he had one good-natured answer: "You will soon come off that and grow wiser."

How great a part Walpole was to play no one could as yet foresee. But even under Marlborough his practical abilities had brought him to the front. At the moment when the House of Commons was recognized as supreme, Walpole showed himself its ablest debater. Commerce promised to become the main interest of England, and the merchants were already beginning to trust to his skill in finance. As a subordinate member of the Whig Ministry at the close of the war he gave signs of that administrative ability which forced his enemies to acknowledge that "he does everything with the same ease and tranquillity as if he were doing nothing." How great was the sense of his power was seen in the action of the triumphant Tories on Marlborough's fall in 1712. Walpole alone of their Whig opponents was singled out for persecution; and a groundless charge of pecculation sent him for a time to the Tower. The great work of the new Tory Ministry was to bring about a peace, and by the conclusion of a separate truce with France it at last forced all the members of the Alliance save the Emperor, who required the pressure of defeat, to consent in 1713 to the Treaty of Utrecht. In this treaty the original aim of the war was silently abandoned, and the principle of the earlier Treaties of Partition adopted in its stead, but with a provision that the crowns of France and Spain should never be united. Philip remained on the Spanish throne; Spain ceded her possessions in Italy and the Netherlands to Charles, who had now become Emperor, in satisfaction of his claims; and handed over Sicily to the Duke of Savoy. Holland regained the right of placing garrisons in the strongest towns of the Netherlands as a barrier against France. England retained her conquests of Minorca

and Gibraltar, which gave her command of the Mediterranean; her sentiment against the French privateers was satisfied by the dis-
 antling of Dunkirk; and Lewis recognized the right of Anne and
 e Protestant succession in the House of Hanover. The failure of
 e Queen's health made the succession the real question of the
 y, and it was a question which turned all politics into faction and
 trigue. The Whigs, to secure the succession of the House of
 anover by the overthrow of the Tories, defeated a Treaty of
 ommerce in which Bolinbroke anticipated the greatest financial
 umph of William Pitt by securing freedom of trade between
 agland and France. The Ministry, on the other hand, in their
 anxiety to strengthen themselves by binding the Church to their
 le, pushed through the Houses a Schism Act, which forbade Dis-
 nters to act as schoolmasters and tutors. But on the question of
 e Succession their course was as hesitating as that of the Queen,
 o hated the House of Hanover and hindered the Electoral Prince
 om coming over to secure the rights of his grandmother Sophia
 taking his seat among the peers as Duke of Cambridge, but who
 as too loyal to the Church to be brought into any real support of
 e Pretender. Harley, who had become Earl of Oxford, intrigued
 th both Hanover and St. Germain. St. John, however, who was
 ised to the peerage as Viscount Bolinbroke, saw that hesitation
 is no longer possible, and flung himself hotly, though secretly,
 to the Jacobite cause. As the crisis grew nearer, both parties
 epared for civil war. In the beginning of 1714 the Whigs made
 ady for a rising on the Queen's death, and invited Marlborough
 om Flanders to head them, in the hope that his name would rally
 e army to their cause. Bolinbroke on the other hand ousted
 arley from office, made the Jacobite Duke of Ormond Warden
 the Cinque Ports, the district in which either claimant of the
 own must land, and gave Scotland in charge to the Jacobite Earl
 Mar. But events moved faster than his plans. On the 30th of
 ily Anne was suddenly struck with apoplexy; and at the news
 e Whig Dukes of Argyll and Somerset entered the Privy Council
 thout summons, and found their cause supported by the Duke
 Shrewsbury, a member of the Tory Ministry, but an adherent of
 e House of Hanover. Shrewsbury was suggested by the Council
 id accepted by the dying Queen as Lord Treasurer. Four regi-
 ents were summoned to the capital, but the Jacobites were
 peless and unprepared, and the Elector George of Hanover, who
 d become heir to the throne on the death of the Princess Sophia,
 as proclaimed as King without opposition.

1712
 to
 1742

The accession of George I. in August 1714 was followed by two
 rking political results. Under Anne the throne had regained
 uch of the older influence which it lost through William's un-
 popularity. Under the two sovereigns who followed Anne the power
 the Crown lay absolutely dormant. They were strangers, to
 hom loyalty in its personal sense was impossible; and their
 aracter as nearly approached insignificance as it is possible for

England
 and the
 House of
 Hanover

human character to approach it. Both were honest and straightforward men, who frankly accepted the irksome position of constitutional kings. But neither had any qualities which could make their honesty attractive to the people at large. The temper of the first was that of a gentleman usher; and his one care was to get money for his favourites and himself. The temper of the second was that of a drill-sergeant, who believed himself master of his realm while he repeated the lessons he had learnt from his wife and which his wife had learnt from the Minister. Their court is familiar enough in the witty memoirs of the time; but as political figures the two Georges are simply absent from our history. England was governed by the Ministers of the Crown, and throughout the whole period these were mere representatives of a single political party. "The Tory party," Bolinbroke wrote immediately after Anne's death, "is gone." It was Bolinbroke more than any other man who had ruined the Tories by diverting them from any practical part in English politics to dreams of a Stuart restoration. The discovery of the Jacobite plots which had been nursed by the late Ministers of the Queen alienated the bulk of the landed gentry, who were still loyal to the Revolution, of the clergy, who dreaded a Catholic King, and of the trading classes, who shrank from the blow to public credit which a Jacobite repudiation of the debt would bring about. The cry of the York mob at the King's accession expressed tersely the creed of the English trader; it shouted, "Liberty, Property, and No Pretender." The policy of Harley and Bolinbroke left the Whigs the only representatives of Revolution principles, of constitutional liberty and religious toleration, and when this was fairly seen, not only merchant and squire but the nation at large went with the Whigs. In the House of Commons after George the First's accession the Tory members hardly numbered fifty, and their Jacobite leanings left them powerless over English politics. The King's Ministry was wholly drawn from the Whig party, though Marlborough and the leaders of the Junto were to their surprise set aside, and the chief offices given to younger men. The direction of affairs was really entrusted to Lord Townshend, who became Secretary of State, and his brother-in-law, Walpole, who successively occupied the posts of Paymaster of the Forces, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and First Lord of the Treasury. The Townshend Administration was the first of a series of Whig Ministries which ruled England for half a century without any serious opposition. The length of their rule was due partly no doubt to an excellent organization. While their adversaries were divided by differences of principle and without leaders of real eminence, the Whigs stood as one man on the principles of the Revolution and produced great leaders who carried them into effect. They submitted with admirable discipline to the guidance of a knot of great landed proprietors, to the houses of Bentinck, Manners, Campbell, and Cavendish, to the Fitzroys and Lennoxes, the Russells and Grenvilles, families whose resistance to the Stuarts,

1712
to
1742

whose share in the Revolution, whose energy in setting the line of anover on the throne, gave them a claim to power which their ber use of it long maintained without dispute. They devoted themselves with immense activity to the gaining and preserving a ascendancy in the House of Commons. The wealth of the Whig ouses was ungrudgingly spent in securing a monopoly of the small id corrupt constituencies which formed a large part of the borough presentation. Of the county members, who were the weightier id more active part of the House, nine-tenths were for a long me relatives and dependants of the Whig families. The support the commercial classes and of the great towns was won not only / the resolute maintenance of public credit, but by the devotion a special attention to questions of trade and finance. But xterous as was their management and compact as was their ganization, it was to nobler qualities than these that the Whigs ved their long rule over England. They were true throughout to e principles on which they had risen into power, and their un-oken administration converted those principles into national bits. Before the fifty years of their rule had passed, Englishmen id forgotten that it was possible to persecute for differences of ligion, or to put down the liberty of the press, or to tamper with e administration of justice, or to rule without a Parliament. ith the steadiness of a great oligarchy, the Whigs combined, no ubt, its characteristic immobility. The tone of their adminis-ation was conservative, cautious, and inactive. They were firm ainst any return to the past, but they shrank from any advance wards a new and more liberal future. "I am no reformer," alpoie used to say, and the years of his power are years without rallel in our history for political stagnation. But for the time is inactivity not only saved them from great dangers, but fell with the temper of the nation at large. Their great stumbling-ocks as a party since the Revolution had been the War and the urch. But they had learnt to leave the Church alone, and their eign policy became a policy of peace. At home their inaction is especially popular with the one class who commonly press for litical activity. The energy of the trading class was absorbed r the time in the rapid extension of commerce and the rapid cumulation of wealth. So long as the country was justly and nstitutionally governed they were content to leave government the hands that held it. They wished only to be let alone to enjoy eir new freedom, to develop their new industries. And the Whigs , them alone. Progress became material rather than political, t the material progress of the country was such as England had ver seen before.

The conversion of England to the Whigs was hastened by a The
seperate attempt of the Pretender to gain the throne. There was Jacobite
real hope of success, for the Jacobites in England were few, and Revolt
e Tories were broken and dispirited by the fall of their leaders.
ard Oxford was impeached and sent to the Tower; while Bolin-

broke fled over-sea at the threat of impeachment, and was followed by the Duke of Ormond, the great hope of the Jacobite party. But James Stuart was as inaccessible to reason as his father had been, and in spite of Bolinbroke's counsels he ordered the Earl of Mar to give the signal for revolt in the North. In Scotland the triumph of the Whigs meant the continuance of the House of Argyll in power, and the rival Highland clans were as ready for a blow at the Campbells under Mar as they had been ready for a blow at them under Dundee or Montrose. But Mar was a leader of different stamp from these. Six thousand Highlanders joined him at Perth, but his cowardice and want of conduct kept his army idle till Argyll had gathered forces to meet it in an indecisive engagement at Sheriffmuir. The Pretender, who arrived too late for the action, proved a yet more sluggish and incapable leader than Mar: and at the close of 1715 the advance of fresh forces drove James over-sea again, and dispersed the clans to their hills. In England, the danger passed away like a dream. A few of the Catholic gentry rose in Northumberland, under Lord Derwentwater and Mr. Forster; and the arrival of two thousand Highlanders who had been sent to join them by Mar spurred them to a march into Lancashire, where the Catholic party was strongest. But they were soon cooped up in Preston, and driven to a cowardly surrender. The leaders paid for their treason with their heads; but no serious steps were taken to put an end to the danger from the north by bringing the clans into order. The Ministry, which was reconstituted at the end of 1716 by the withdrawal of Townshend and Walpole, and now acknowledged Lord Stanhope as its head, availed itself of the Whig triumph to bring about a repeal of the Schism and the Occasional Conformity Acts, and to venture with varying success on two constitutional changes. Under the Triennial Bill of William's reign the duration of a Parliament was limited to three years. Now that the House of Commons, however, was become the ruling power in the State, a change was absolutely required to secure steadiness and fixity of political action; and in 1716 the duration of Parliament was extended to seven years by the Septennial Bill. The power which Harley's creation of twelve peers showed the Crown to possess of swamping the majority in the House of Peers prompted the Ministry in 1720 to introduce a bill, whose origin was attributed to Lord Sunderland, and which professed to secure the liberty of that House by limiting the Peerage to its present number in England and substituting twenty-five hereditary for the sixteen elected Peers from Scotland. The bill was strenuously opposed by Walpole, who had withdrawn from the Ministry on the expulsion of his friend Lord Townshend from office; and to Walpole's opposition it mainly owed its defeat. It would, in fact, have rendered representative government impossible; for representative government, as we have seen, had come to mean government by the will of the House of Commons, and had Sunderland's bill passed no power would have been left which could have forced the Peers to

w to the will of the Lower House in matters where their opinion is adverse to it.

Abroad the Whigs aimed strictly at the maintenance of peace a faithful adhesion to the Treaty of Utrecht. The one obstacle to peace was Spain. Its King, Philip of Anjou, had ceded the Italian possessions of his crown and renounced his own rights of succession to the throne of France, but his constant dream was to over all he had given up. To attempt this was to defy Europe;

Austria held the late possessions of Spain in Italy, the Milanese and Naples, while France, since the death of Lewis the Fourteenth (1715), was ruled by the Regent Duke of Orleans, who stood at under the treaty in succession to the French throne through Philip's renunciation. But the boldness of Cardinal Alberoni, who was now the Spanish Minister, accepted the risk. He began to intrigue against the Regent in France, and supported the Jacobite cause as a means of preventing the interference of England with his designs. He gained the aid of Sweden through the resentment of Charles the Twelfth at the cession to Hanover of the Swedish possessions of Bremen and Verden by the King of Denmark, who had seized them while Charles was absent in Turkey, a cession of the highest importance to the Electoral dominions, which were thus brought into contact with the sea, and of hardly less value to England, as it secured the mouths of the Elbe and the Weser, the chief inlets for British commerce into Germany, to a friendly state. But the efforts of Alberoni were foiled by the union of his opponents. His first attempt was to recover the Italian provinces which Philip had lost, and armaments greater than Spain had seen for a century were used. Sardinia in 1716, and attacked Sicily. England and France once drew together, and were joined by Holland in a Triple Alliance, concluded in the opening of 1717, and which guaranteed the succession of the House of Hanover in England, as well as of the House of Orleans in France, should its boy king, Lewis XV., die without issue. The Triple Alliance became a Quadruple Alliance in 1718 by the accession of the Emperor, whose Italian possessions the three Powers had guaranteed; and the appearance of an English squadron in the Straits of Messina was followed by an armament in which the Spanish fleet was all but destroyed.

Alberoni strove to avenge the blow by fitting out an armament of which the Duke of Ormond was to command for the revival of the Jacobite rising in Scotland, but his fleet was wrecked in the Bay of Biscay; and the progress of the French armies in the north of France forced Philip at last to dismiss his Minister, to renew his renunciation of the French throne, and to withdraw from Sardinia and Sicily, on condition that the reversion of Parma and Tuscany should be secured to his son, the Infante Don Carlos. Sicily now was ceded to the Emperor, and Savoy was recompensed for its loss by the acquisition of Sardinia, from which its Duke took the title of King. At the same moment the schemes of Charles the Twelfth, who had concluded an alliance with the Czar, Peter the Great, for

1712

to
1742The
Whigs
and
Europe

1712
to
1742

a restoration of the Stuarts, were brought to an end by his death at the siege of Frederickshall. But the ability and sense which Stanhope and his fellow Ministers showed in their foreign policy utterly failed them in dealing with the power of speculation which the sudden increase of commerce was rousing at home. The unknown wealth of South America had acted ever since the days of the Buccaneers like a spell on the imagination of Englishmen; and Harley gave countenance to a South Sea Company, which promised a reduction of the public debt as the price of a monopoly of the Spanish trade. Spain however clung jealously to her old prohibitions of all foreign commerce; the Treaty of Utrecht only won for England the right of engaging in the negro slave-trade, and of despatching a single ship to the coast; but in spite of all this, the Company again came forward, offering in exchange for new privileges to pay off national burdens which amounted to nearly a million a year. It was in vain that Walpole warned the Ministry and the country against this "dream." Both went mad; and in 1720 bubble Company followed bubble Company, till the inevitable reaction brought a general ruin in its train.

Wal-
pole's
Peace
Policy

The crash brought Stanhope to the grave. Of his colleagues, many were found to have received bribes from the South Sea Company to back its frauds. Craggs, the Secretary of State, died of terror at the investigation; Aislabie, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, was sent to the Tower; and in the general wreck of his rivals Walpole mounted again into power. His factious conduct when out of office had been redeemed by his opposition to the Peerage Bill: his weight with the country dates from his prescient warnings against the South Sea speculation. In 1721 he again became First Lord of the Treasury, while Townshend returned to his post of Secretary of State. But there was nothing to promise the longest tenure of power which any English Minister since the Revolution has ever enjoyed, for Walpole remained at the head of affairs for twenty-one years. But his long administration is almost without a history. All legislative and political activity abruptly ceased with his entry into office. Year after year passed by without a change. In the third year of his Ministry there was but one division in the House of Commons. The Tory members were so few that for a time they hardly cared to attend its sittings; and in 1722 the loss of Bishop Atterbury of Rochester, who was convicted of correspondence with the Pretender, deprived of his bishopric, and banished by Act of Parliament, deprived the Jacobite party of their only remaining leader. But quiet as was the air of English politics under Walpole, his policy was in the main a large and noble one. He was the first and greatest of our Peace Ministers. "The most pernicious circumstances," he said, "in which this country can be are those of war; as we must be losers while it lasts and cannot be great gainers when it ends." In spite of the complications of foreign affairs and the pressure from the Court and Opposition, he resolutely kept England at peace. It

1712
to
1742

as not that the honour or influence of England suffered in Walpole's hands, for he won victories by the firmness of his policy and the skill of his negotiations as effectual as those which are won by arms. The most pressing danger to European tranquillity lay in the fact that the Emperor Charles the Sixth was without a son. He had issued a Pragmatic Sanction, by which he provided that his hereditary dominions in Austria, Hungary, and Bohemia should descend unbroken to his daughter, Maria Theresa; but the European powers had as yet declined to guarantee her succession. Spain, however, anxious as of old to recover Gibraltar and Minorca from England, and still irritated against France, offered not only to waive her own claims and guarantee the Pragmatic Sanction, but to grant the highest trading privileges in her American dominions to a commercial trading company which the Emperor had established at Ostend in defiance of the Treaty of Westphalia and the remonstrances of England and Holland, on condition that the Emperor secured the succession of Carlos, Philip's second son, to the Duchies of Parma and Tuscany. At the same time Russia, which was now governed by Catherine, the wife of Peter the Great, joined Sweden into an alliance for an attack upon Denmark, and prettily negotiated with Spain and the Emperor. Townshend met the last danger by a defensive treaty between France, England, and Prussia, which he concluded at Hanover, by a subsidy which detached Sweden from her ally, and by the despatch of a squadron to the Baltic. But the withdrawal of Prussia from the Treaty of Hanover gave fresh courage to the Emperor, and in 1727 Charles threw his ambassador from England, while Philip began the siege of Gibraltar. The Emperor, however, was held in check by the death of the Russian Empress and the firm attitude of England, France, and Holland; and Spain, finding herself too weak to wage war alone, concluded in 1729 the Treaty of Seville with the three powers. The Emperor still held aloof till 1731, when the five States met in the Treaty of Vienna, which satisfied Spain by giving the Italian Duchies to Don Carlos, while the maritime powers contented Charles by guaranteeing the Pragmatic Sanction.

Walpole was not only the first English Peace Minister; he was the first English Minister who was a great financier, and who regarded the development of national wealth and the adjustment of national burdens as the business of a statesman. His time of power was a time of great material prosperity. In 1724 the King would congratulate the country on its possession of "peace with powers abroad, at home perfect tranquillity, plenty, and an interrupted enjoyment of all civil and religious rights." Population was growing fast. That of Manchester and Birmingham doubled in thirty years. The rise of manufactures was accompanied by a sudden increase of commerce, which was due mainly to the rapid development of our colonies. Liverpool, which owes its existence to the new trade with the West, sprang up from a little inland town into the third port in the kingdom. With peace and

Wal-
pole's
finance

security, the value of land, and with it the rental of every country gentleman, tripled; while the introduction of winter roots, of artificial grasses, of the system of a rotation of crops, changed the whole character of agriculture, and spread wealth through the farming classes. The wealth around him never made Walpole swerve from a rigid economy, from the steady reduction of the debt, or the diminution of fiscal duties. Even before the death of George the First the public burdens were reduced by twenty millions. But he had the sense to see that the wisest course a statesman can take in presence of a great increase in national industry and national wealth is to look quietly on and let it alone. What he did do however was wise, and what he strove to do was yet wiser. As early as 1720 he declared in a speech from the Throne that nothing would more conduce to the extension of commerce "than to make the exportation of our own manufactures, and the importation of the commodities used in the manufacturing of them, as practicable and easy as may be." The first act of his financial administration was to take off the duties from more than a hundred British exports, and nearly forty articles of importation. In 1730 he broke in the same enlightened spirit through the prejudice which restricted the commerce of the colonies to the mother-country alone, by allowing Georgia and the Carolinas to export their rice directly to any part of Europe. The result was that the rice of America soon drove that of Italy and Egypt from the market. His Excise Bill, defective as it was, was the first measure in which an English Minister showed any real grasp of the principles of taxation. No tax had from the first moment of its introduction been more unpopular than the Excise. Its origin was due to Pym and the Long Parliament, who imposed duties on beer, cider, and perry, which at the Restoration produced an annual income of more than six hundred thousand pounds. The war with France brought with it the malt-tax and additional duties on spirits, wine, tobacco, and other articles. So great had been the increase in the public wealth that the return from the Excise amounted at the death of George the First to nearly two millions and a half a year. But its unpopularity remained unabated, and even philosophers like Locke contended that the whole public revenue should be drawn from direct taxes upon the land. Walpole, on the other hand, saw in the growth of indirect taxation a means of freeing the land from all burdens whatever. Smuggling and fraud diminished the revenue by immense sums. The loss on tobacco alone amounted to a third of the whole duty. The Excise Bill of 1733 met this evil by the establishment of bonded warehouses, and by the collection of the duties from the inland dealers in the form of Excise and not of Customs. The first measure would have made London a free port, and doubled English trade. The second would have so largely increased the revenue, without any loss to the consumer, as to enable Walpole to repeal the land-tax. In the case of tea and coffee alone, the change in the mode of levying the duty brought in

additional hundred thousand pounds a year. The necessities of life and the raw materials of manufacture were in Walpole's hands to remain absolutely untaxed. Every part of Walpole's scheme has since been carried into effect; but in 1733 he stood before his time. An agitation of unprecedented violence forced him to withdraw the bill.

But if Walpole's aims were wise and statesmanlike, he was unscrupulous in the means by which he realized them. Personally he was free from corruption; and he is perhaps the first great English statesman who left office poorer than when he entered it. But he was certainly the first who made parliamentary corruption a regular part of his system of government. Corruption was older than Walpole, for it sprang out of the very transfer of power to the House of Commons which had begun with the Restoration. The transfer was complete, and the House was supreme in the state; but while freeing itself from the control of the Crown, it was as yet only imperfectly responsible to the people. It was only at election time that a member felt the pressure of public opinion. The secrecy of parliamentary proceedings, which had been needful as a safeguard against royal interference with debate, served as a safeguard against interference on the part of constituencies. This strange union of immense power with absolute freedom from responsibility brought about its natural results in the bulk of members. A vote was too valuable to be given without recompense. Parliamentary support had to be bought by places, pensions, and bribes in hard cash. Walpole was probably less corrupt than Danby who preceded or the Pelhams who followed him, but he was far more liberal in his avowal of corruption. Even if he was falsely credited with the saying that "every man has his price," he was always ready to pay the price of any man who was worth having. And he was driven to employ corruption lavishly by the very character of his rule. In the absence of a strong opposition and of great impulses to enthusiasm a party breaks readily into factions; and the weakness of the Tories joined with the stagnation of public affairs to beget faction among the Whigs. Walpole, too, was a lover of power: and as his jealousy drove colleague after colleague out of office, they became leaders of a party of so-called "Patriots" whose whole end was to drive the Minister from his post. This big faction, which was headed by Pulteney and Lord Chesterfield, rallied to it the fragment of the Tory party which remained, and which was now guided by the virulent ability of Bolingbroke, whom Walpole had suffered to return from exile, but to whom he had refused the restoration of his seat in the House of Lords.

Through the reign of George the First these "Patriots" increased in numbers, and at the accession of his son George the Second in 1727 they counted on their enemy's fall; for the new King hated his father and his father's counsellors, and had spoken of Walpole as "a rogue." But jealous of authority as he was, George the

1712
to
1742

Walpole
and the
Parliament

Walpole
and
Queen
Caroline

1712
to
1742

Second was absolutely guided by the adroitness of his wife, Caroline of Anspach, and Caroline had resolved that there should be no change in the Ministry. The ten years which followed were in fact the years during which Walpole's power was at its highest. The Jacobites refused to stir. The Church was quiet. The Dissenters pressed for a repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, but Walpole was resolved not to rouse passions of religious hate which only slumbered, and satisfied them by an annual Act of Indemnity for any breach of these penal statutes. A few trade measures and social reforms crept quietly through the Houses. An inquiry into the state of the gaols showed that social thought was not utterly dead. A bill of great value enacted that all proceedings in courts of justice should henceforth be in the English language. Walpole's chief effort at financial reform, the Excise Bill of 1733, was foiled as we have seen by the factious ignorance of the "Patriots." The violence of his opponents was backed by an outburst of popular prejudice; riots almost grew into revolt; and in spite of the Queen's wish to put down resistance by force, Walpole withdrew the bill. "I will not be the minister," he said with noble self-command, "to enforce taxes at the expense of blood." He showed equal wisdom and courage in the difficulties which again rose abroad. In 1733 the peace of Europe was broken afresh by disputes which rose out of a contested election to the throne of Poland. The King was eager to fight, and even Caroline's German sympathies inclined her to join in the fray; but Walpole stood firm for the observance of neutrality. "There are fifty thousand men slain this year in Europe," he was able to say as the war went on, "and not one Englishman." The intervention of England and Holland succeeded in 1736 in restoring peace at the cost of the cession of Naples to Don Carlos and of Lorraine to France.

The
Spanish
War

Walpole's defeat on the Excise Bill had done little to shake his power, and Bolinbroke withdrew to France in despair at the failure of his efforts. But the Queen's death in 1737, and the violent support which the Prince of Wales gave the "Patriots" from hatred to his father, were more serious blows. The country, too, wearied at last of its monotonous prosperity and of its monotonous peace. It was hard to keep from war in the Southern Seas. The merchant class were determined to carry on their trade with Spanish America, a trade which rested indeed on no legal right, but had grown largely through the connivance of the Spanish officers during the long alliance with England from 1670 to the War of Succession. But the accession of a French prince to the Spanish throne had brought about a cessation of this connivance. Philip of Anjou was hostile to English trade with his American dominions; and the efforts of Spain to preserve its own monopoly, to put down the vast system of smuggling which rendered it valueless, and to restrict English commerce to the negro slave-trade and the single ship stipulated by the Treaty of Utrecht, brought about collisions which made it hard to keep the peace. Walpole, who strove to do justice to both

rties in the matter, was abused as "the cur-dog of England and aniel of France." The ill-humour of the trading classes rose to adness in 1738 when a merchant captain named Jenkins told at e bar of the House of Commons the tale of his torture by the aniards, and produced an ear which he said they had cut off th taunts at the English king. It was in vain that Walpole ttled stubbornly against the cry for war. His negotiations were led by the frenzy of the one country and the pride of the other. e stood alone in his desire for peace. His peace policy rested on e alliance with Holland and France; but the temporary hostility cited by the disputes over the succession between Philip and the use of Orleans had passed away with the birth of children to wis the Fifteenth, and the Bourbon Courts were again united family sympathies. He foresaw therefore that a Spanish war ould probably bring with it the rupture of the French alliance at e very moment when the approaching death of the Emperor ide the union of the western powers essential to the peace of rope. Against a war which undid all that he had laboured for enty years to do Walpole struggled hard. But the instinct of the tion was in fact wiser than the policy of the Minister. Although ither England nor Walpole knew it, a Family Compact had been ncluded between France and Spain as long before as 1733, on the tbreak of the war of the Polish Succession, for the ruin of the aritime supremacy of England. Spain bound herself to deprive ngland gradually of her commercial privileges in America, and transfer her trade to France. France in return engaged to pport Spain at sea and to aid her in the recovery of Gibraltar. ie caution with which Walpole held aloof from the Polish war ndered the Compact inoperative at the time, but neither country ased to look forward to its future execution. France since e peace had strained every nerve to prepare a fleet; while ain had steadily increased the restrictions on British commerce. oth were in fact watching for the opportunity of war which e Emperor's death was sure to afford, and in forcing on the uggle England only anticipated a danger which she could not ape.

The Compact however, though suspected, was still unknown, and e perils of a contest with Spain were clear enough to justify alpole in struggling hard for peace. But he struggled single-nded. His greed of power had mastered his strong common sense; ord Townshend had been driven from office in 1730, Lord Chesterld dismissed in 1733; and though he started with the ablest ministration ever known, Walpole was left after twenty years of ministration with but a single man of ability, the Chancellor, ord Hardwicke, in his cabinet. The colleagues whom, one by one, s jealousy had dismissed had plunged, with the exception of ownshend, into an opposition more factious and unprincipled an had ever disgraced English politics; and these "Patriots" are now reinforced by a band of younger Whigs—the "Boys,"

1712
to
1742

Fall of
Walpole

1712
to
1742

as Walpole called them—whose temper revolted alike against the peace and corruption of his policy, and at whose head stood a young cornet of horse, William Pitt. Baffled as this opposition had been for so many years, the sudden rush of popular passion gave it a new strength, and in 1739 Walpole bowed to its will in declaring war. "They may ring their bells now," the Minister said bitterly, as peals and bonfires welcomed his defeat, "but they will soon be wringing their hands." His foresight was quickly justified. No sooner had Admiral Vernon with an English fleet bombarded and taken Portobello than France refused to suffer England to settle on the mainland of South America, and despatched two squadrons to the West Indies. At this crisis the death of Charles the Sixth (Oct. 1740) forced on the European struggle which Walpole had dreaded. France saw in this event and the disunion which it at once brought about an opportunity of finishing the work begun by Henry the Second, and which Richelieu, Lewis the Fourteenth, and Cardinal Fleury had carried on—the work of breaking up the Empire into a group of powers too weak to resist French ambition. In union therefore with Spain, which aimed at the annexation of the Milanese, and the King of Prussia, Frederick the Second, who at once occupied Silesia, France backed the Elector of Bavaria in his claim on the Duchy of Austria, which passed with the other hereditary dominions, by the Pragmatic Sanction, to the Queen of Hungary, Maria Theresa. Sweden and Sardinia allied themselves to France. England alone showed herself true to her guaranty of the Austrian Succession. In the summer of 1741 two French armies entered Germany, and the Elector of Bavaria appeared unopposed before Vienna. Never had the House of Austria stood in such utter peril. Its opponents counted on a division of its dominions. France claimed the Netherlands, Spain the Milanese, Bavaria the kingdom of Bohemia, Frederick the Second Silesia. Hungary and the Duchy of Austria alone were to be left to Maria Theresa. Even England, though still true to her cause, advised her to purchase Frederick's aid by the cession of Silesia. But the Queen refused to despair. She won the support of Hungary by restoring its constitutional rights; and the subsidies of England enabled her to march at the head of a Hungarian army to the rescue of Vienna, to overrun Bavaria, and repulse an attack of Frederick on Moravia in the spring of 1742. But on England's part the contest went on feebly and ineffectively. Admiral Vernon was beaten before Carthage; and Walpole was charged with thwarting and starving the war. He still repelled the attacks of the "Patriots" with wonderful spirit; but in a new Parliament his majority dropped to sixteen, and in his own cabinet he became almost powerless. The buoyant temper which had carried him through so many storms broke down at last. "He who was asleep as soon as his head touched the pillow," writes his son, "now never sleeps above an hour without waking: and he who at dinner always forgot his own anxieties, and was more gay and thoughtless than all the company, now sits

thout speaking, and with his eyes fixed for an hour together." 1712
e end was in fact near; and the dwindling of his majority to
ree forced Walpole in the opening of 1742 to resign. 1742

The attitude of Bolingbroke at the close of the reign of Anne must
rays remain a matter of some doubt. It is by no means certain that he
dred a Jacobite restoration; it is certain that Swift, his intimate
end, did not. Perhaps the most probable conclusion is that Bolingbroke
shed to be in a position of such supremacy that he might dictate to
h parties and award the crown upon his own terms.

The alliance, negotiated by Ripperdá, between Spain and Austria
vided that the trading privileges conceded to England by the Treaty
Utrecht should be transferred to Austria; that a double marriage
ance should be concluded, Maria Theresa and Don Carlos succeeding
the Austrian dominions, other than those in Italy, which were to pass
Don Philip and the Archduchess Maria Ameha; and that Gibraltar
uld be restored to Spain.

CHAPTER X

MODERN ENGLAND

SECTION I.—WILLIAM PITT, 1742—1762

[*Authorities.*—Horace Walpole's and Hervey's "Memoirs" and Horace Walpole's Letters are valuable sources. Lecky's "History of England in the Eighteenth Century" is the best general history of the period. For Pitt, the Chatham Correspondence and the biography by Ruville. For Frederic the Great, see Carlyle's "Frederic the Great." For Clive, see Malcolm's biography, and Mill's "British India." For Wesley, see lives by Southey and Tyerman. Macaulay's essays on Chatham and Clive are illuminating.]

The
Church
and the
Georges

THE fall of Walpole revealed a change in the temper of England which was to influence from that time to this its social and political history. New forces, new cravings, new aims, which had been silently gathering beneath the crust of inaction, burst suddenly into view. The first of these embodied itself in the religious and philanthropic movement which bears the name of Wesley. Never had religion seemed at a lower ebb. The progress of free inquiry, the aversion from theological strife which had been left by the Civil War, the new intellectual and material channels opened to human energy, had produced a general indifference to the great questions of religious speculation which occupied an earlier age. The Church, predominant as its influence seemed at the close of the Revolution, had sunk into political insignificance. By a suspension of the sittings of Convocation Walpole deprived the clergy of their chief means of agitation, while he carefully abstained from all measures which could arouse the prejudices of their flocks. The bishops, who were exclusively chosen from among the small number of Whig ecclesiastics, were rendered powerless by the Toryism and estrangement of their clergy, while the clergy themselves stood apart from all active interference in public affairs. Nor was their political repose compensated by any religious activity. A large number of prelates were mere Whig partizans with no higher aim than that of promotion. The levees of the Ministers were crowded with lawn sleeves. A Welsh bishop avowed that he had seen his diocese but once, and habitually resided at the lakes of Westmoreland. The system of pluralities turned the wealthier and more learned of the priesthood into absentees, while the bulk of them were indolent, poor, and without social consideration. A shrewd, if prejudiced, observer brands the English clergy of the day as the most lifeless in Europe, "the most remiss of their labours in private, and the least severe in their lives." The decay of the great dissenting bodies went hand in hand with that of the Church, and during the

ly part of the century the Nonconformists declined in number in energy. But it would be rash to conclude from this outer ecclesiastical paralysis that the religious sentiment was dead in the people at large. There was, no doubt, a revolt against religion and against churches in both the extremes of English society. In the higher circles "everyone laughs," said Montesquieu on his visit to England, "if one talks of religion." Of the prominent statesmen of the time the greater part were unbelievers in any form of Christianity, and distinguished for the grossness and immorality of their lives. Drunkenness and foul talk were thought no discredit

Walpole. A later prime minister, the Duke of Grafton, was in the habit of appearing with his mistress at the play. Purity and fidelity to the marriage vow were sneered out of fashion; and Lord Chesterfield, in his letters to his son, instructs him in the art of seduction as part of a polite education. At the other end of the social scale lay the masses of the poor. They were ignorant and brutal to a degree which it is hard to conceive, for the vast increase of population which followed on the growth of towns and the development of manufactures had been met by no effort for their religious or educational improvement. Not a new parish had been created. Hardly a single new church had been built. Schools there were none, save the grammar schools of Edward and Elizabeth. The rural peasantry, who were fast being reduced to pauperism by the abuse of the poor-laws, were left without moral or religious training of any sort. "We saw but one Bible in the parish of Hedder," said Hannah More at a far later time, "and that was used to prop a flower-pot." Within the towns things were worse. There was no effective police; and in great outbreaks the mob of London or Birmingham burnt houses, flung open prisons, and sacked and pillaged at their will. The criminal class gathered boldness and numbers in the face of ruthless laws which only testified to the terror of society, laws which made it a capital crime to cut down a cherry tree, and which strung up twenty young thieves of a morning in front of Newgate; while the introduction of gin gave a new impetus to drunkenness. In the streets of London shops invited every passer-by to get drunk for a penny, or to be drunk for twopenny.

In spite however of scenes such as this, England as a whole remained at heart religious. Even the apathy of the clergy was tinged with a new spirit of charity and good sense, a tendency to subordinate ecclesiastical differences to the thought of a common Christianity, and to substitute a rational theology for the worn-out traditions of the past. In the middle class the old piety lived on unchanged, and it was from this class that a religious revival burst forth at the close of Walpole's ministry, which changed in a few years the whole temper of English society. The Church was restored to life and activity. Religion carried to the hearts of the poor a fresh spirit of moral zeal, while it purified our literature and our manners. A new philanthropy reformed our prisons, infused

The Religious
Revival

clemency and wisdom into our penal laws, abolished the slave trade, and gave the first impulse to popular education. The revival began in a small knot of Oxford students, whose revolt against the religious deadness of their times showed itself in ascetic observances, an enthusiastic devotion, and a methodical regularity of life which gained them the nickname of "Methodists." Three figures detached themselves from the group as soon as, on its transfer to London in 1738, it attracted public attention by the fervour and even extravagance of its piety; and each found his special work in the great task to which the instinct of the new movement led it from the first, that of carrying religion and morality to the vast masses of population which lay concentrated in the towns or around the mines and collieries of Cornwall and the north. Whitfield, a servitor of Pembroke College, was above all the preacher of the revival. Speech was governing English politics; and the religious power of speech was shown when a dread of "enthusiasm" closed against the new apostles the pulpits of the Established Church, and forced them to preach in the fields. Their voice was soon heard in the wildest and most barbarous corners of the land, among the bleak moors of Northumberland, or in the dens of London, or in the long galleries where the Cornish miner hears in the pauses of his labour the sobbing of the sea. Whitfield's preaching was such as England had never heard before, theatrical, extravagant, often commonplace, but hushing all criticism by its intense reality, its earnestness of belief, its deep tremulous sympathy with the sin and sorrow of mankind. It was no common enthusiast who could wring gold from the close-fisted Franklin and admiration from the fastidious Horace Walpole, or who could look down from the top of a green knoll at Kingswood on twenty thousand colliers, grimy from the Bristol coalpits, and see as he preached the tears "making white channels down their blackened cheeks." On the rough and ignorant masses to whom they spoke the effect of Whitfield and his fellow Methodists was terrible both for good and ill. Their preaching stirred a passionate hatred in their opponents. Their lives were often in danger, they were mobbed, they were ducked, they were stoned, they were smothered with filth. But the enthusiasm they aroused was equally passionate. Women fell down in convulsions; strong men were smitten suddenly to the earth; the preacher was interrupted by bursts of hysteric laughter or of hysteric sobbing. All the phenomena of strong spiritual excitement, so familiar now, but at that time strange and unknown, followed on their sermons; and the terrible sense of a conviction of sin, a new dread of hell, a new hope of heaven, took forms at once grotesque and sublime. Charles Wesley, a Christ Church student, came to add sweetness to this sudden and startling light. He was the "sweet singer" of the movement. His hymns expressed the fiery conviction of its converts in lines so chaste and beautiful that its more extravagant features disappeared. The wild throes of hysteric enthusiasm passed into a passion for hymn-singing, and a new musical impulse

as aroused in the people which gradually changed the face of public devotion throughout England.

But it was his elder brother, John Wesley, who embodied in itself not this or that side of the vast movement, but the very movement itself. Even at Oxford, where he resided as a fellow

1742
to
1762

John
Wesley

Lincoln, he had been looked upon as head of the group of Methodists, and after his return from a quixotic mission to the Indians of Georgia he again took the lead of the little society, which he removed in the interval to London. In power as a preacher he stood next to Whitfield; as a hymn-writer he stood second to his other Charles. But while combining in some degree the excellences of either, he possessed qualities in which both were utterly deficient; an indefatigable industry, a cool judgment, a commander others, a faculty of organization, a singular union of patience and moderation with an imperious ambition, which marked him as a ruler of men. He had, besides, a learning and skill in writing which no other of the Methodists possessed; he was older than any of his colleagues at the start of the movement, and he outlived them all. His life indeed from 1703 to 1791 almost covers the century, and the Methodist body had passed through every phase of its history before he sank into the grave at the age of eighty-eight. It would have been impossible for Wesley to have wielded the power he did had he not shared the follies and extravagances as well as the enthusiasm of his disciples. Throughout his life his criticism was that of a monk. At times he lived on bread only, and often slept on the bare boards. He lived in a world of wonders and divine interpositions. It was a miracle if the rain stopped and allowed him to set forward on a journey. It was a judgment of heaven if a hailstorm burst over a town which had been deaf to his preaching. One day, he tells us, when he was tired and his horse fell lame, "I thought—cannot God heal either man or beast by any means or without any?—immediately my headache ceased and my horse's lameness in the same instant." With a still more childish fanaticism he guided his conduct, whether in ordinary events or in the great crises of his life, by drawing lots or watching the particular texts at which his Bible opened. But with all this extravagance and superstition, Wesley's mind was essentially practical, orderly, and conservative. No man ever stood at the head of a great revolution whose temper was so anti-revolutionary. At his earlier days the bishops had been forced to rebuke him for the narrowness and intolerance of his churchmanship. When Whitfield began his sermons in the fields, Wesley "could not at first reconcile himself to that strange way." He condemned and fought against the admission of laymen as preachers till he found himself left with none but laymen to preach. To the last he clung passionately to the Church of England, and looked on the body he had formed as but a lay society in full communion with it. He broke with the Moravians, who had been the earliest friends of the new movement, when they endangered its safe conduct by their

1742
to
1762

contempt of religious forms. He broke with Whitfield when the great preacher plunged into an extravagant Calvinism. But the same practical temper of mind which led him to reject what was unmeasured, and to be the last to adopt what was new, enabled him at once to grasp and organize the novelties he adopted. He became himself the most unwearied of field preachers, and his journal for half a century is little more than a record of fresh journeys and fresh sermons. When once driven to employ lay helpers in his ministry he made their work a new and attractive feature in his system. His earlier asceticism only lingered in a dread of social enjoyments and an aversion from the gayer and sunnier side of life which links the Methodist movement with that of the Puritans. As the fervour of his superstition died down into the calm of age, his cool common sense discouraged in his followers the enthusiastic outbursts which marked the opening of the revival. His powers were bent to the building up of a great religious society which might give to the new enthusiasm a lasting and practical form. The Methodists were grouped into classes, gathered in love-feasts, purified by the expulsion of unworthy members, and furnished with an alternation of settled ministers and wandering preachers; while the whole body was placed under the absolute government of a Conference of ministers. But so long as he lived the direction of the new religious society remained with Wesley alone. "If by arbitrary power," he replied with a charming simplicity to objectors, "you mean a power which I exercise simply without any colleagues therein, this is certainly true, but I see no hurt in it."

The new
Philan-
thropy

The great body which he thus founded—a body which numbered a hundred thousand members at his death, and which now counts its members in England and America by millions—bears the stamp of Wesley in more than its name. Of all Protestant Churches it is the most rigid in its organization and the most despotic in its government. But the Methodists themselves were the least result of the Methodist revival. Its action upon the Church broke the lethargy of the clergy, and the "Evangelical" movement, which found representatives like Newton and Cecil within the pale of the Establishment, made the fox-hunting parson and the absentee rector at last impossible. In Walpole's day the English clergy were the idlest and most lifeless in the world. In our own time no body of religious ministers surpasses them in piety, in philanthropic energy, or in popular regard. In the nation at large appeared a new moral enthusiasm which, rigid and pedantic as it often seemed, was still healthy in its social tone, and whose power was seen in the disappearance of the profligacy which had disgraced the upper classes, and the foulness which had infested literature, ever since the Restoration. But the noblest result of the religious revival was the steady attempt, which has never ceased from that day to this, to remedy the guilt, the ignorance, the physical suffering, the social degradation of the profligate and the poor. It was not till

the Wesleyan movement had done its work that the philanthropic movement began. The Sunday Schools established by Mr. Raikes at Gloucester at the close of the century were the beginnings of popular education. By writings and by her own personal example Hannah More drew the sympathy of England to the poverty and misfortune of the agricultural labourer. The passionate impulse of human sympathy with the wronged and afflicted raised hospitals, endowed charities, built churches, sent missionaries to the heathen, supported Burke in his plea for the Hindoo, and Clarkson and Wilberforce in their crusade against the iniquity of the slave-trade. It is only the moral chivalry of his labours that amongst a crowd of philanthropists draws us most, perhaps, to the work and character

John Howard. The sympathy which all were feeling for the sufferings of mankind he felt for the sufferings of the worst and most hapless of men. With wonderful ardour and perseverance he devoted himself to the cause of the debtor, the felon, and the murderer. His appointment to the office of High Sheriff of Bedfordshire drew his attention in 1774 to the state of the prisons which were placed in his care; and from that time the quiet country gentleman, whose only occupation had been reading his Bible and studying his thermometer, became the most energetic and zealous of reformers. Before a year was over he had personally visited most every English gaol, and he found in nearly all of them frightful abuses which had been noticed half a century before, but left unredressed by Parliament. Gaolers, who bought their places, were paid by fees, and suffered to extort what they could. Even when acquitted men were dragged back to their cells for want of funds to discharge the sums they owed to their keepers. Debtors and felons were huddled together in the prisons, which Howard found crowded by the cruel legislation of the day. No separation was preserved between different sexes, no criminal discipline enforced. Every gaol was a chaos of cruelty and the foulest immorality, from which the prisoner could only escape by sheer starvation or by the gaol-fever that festered without ceasing in these haunts of wretchedness. He saw everything with his own eyes, he tested every suffering by his own experience. In one gaol he found a cell so narrow and noisome that the poor wretch who inhabited it begged as a mercy for hanging. Howard shut himself up in the cell and bore its darkness and foulness till nature could bear no more. But it was by work of this sort, and by the faithful pictures of such scenes which it enabled him to give, that he brought about their reform. The work in which he recorded his terrible experience, and the plans which he submitted for the reformation of criminals, make him the father, so far as England is concerned, of prison discipline. But his labours were far from being confined to England. In journey after journey he visited the prisons of Holland and Germany, till his longing to discover some means of checking the fatal progress of the Plague led him to examine the lazarettos of Europe and the East. He was still

1742 engaged in this work of charity when he was seized by a malignant
to fever at Cherson in Southern Russia, and "laid quietly in the
1762 earth," as he desired.

The Pel-
hams

While the revival of the Wesleys was stirring the very heart of England, its political stagnation was unbroken. The triumph of Walpole's opponents ended with their victory. Retiring to the Peers as Earl of Orford, he devoted himself to breaking up the opposition and restoring the union of the Whigs, while he remained the confidential counsellor of the King. Pulteney accepted the Earldom of Bath and at once lost much of his political weight, while his more prominent followers were admitted to office. But when on the death of their nominal leader, Lord Wilmington, Pulteney claimed the post of First Minister in 1743, Walpole quietly interfered and induced the King to raise Henry Pelham, the brother of the Duke of Newcastle, and one of his own most faithful adherents, to the head of the administration. The temper of Henry Pelham, as well as a consciousness of his own mediocrity, disposed him to a policy of conciliation which reunited the Whigs, and included every man of ability in his new Ministry. The union of the party was aided by the reappearance of a danger which seemed to have passed away. The foreign policy of Walpole triumphed at the moment of his fall. The pressure of England, aided by a victory of Frederick at Chotusitz, forced Maria Theresa to consent to a peace with Prussia on the terms of the cession of Silesia; and this peace enabled the Austrian army to drive the French from Bohemia at the close of 1742. Meanwhile one English fleet blockaded Cadiz, another anchored in the bay of Naples and forced Don Carlos by a threat of bombarding his capital to conclude a treaty of neutrality, while English subsidies detached Sardinia from the French alliance. But at this point the loss of Walpole made itself felt. The foreign policy of the weak Ministry which succeeded him was chiefly directed by Lord Carteret; and Carteret, who, like the bulk of the Whig party, had long been opposed in heart to Walpole's system, resolved to change the whole character of the war. While Walpole limited his efforts to the preservation of the House of Austria as a European power, Carteret joined Maria Theresa in aiming at the ruin of the House of Bourbon. In the dreams of the statesmen of Vienna, the whole face of Europe was to be changed. Naples and Sicily were to be taken back from Spain, Elsass and Lorraine from France; and the Imperial dignity which had passed to the Elector of Bavaria, the Emperor Charles VII., was to be restored to the Austrian House. To carry out these schemes an Austrian army drove the Emperor from Bavaria in the spring of 1743; while George the Second, who warmly supported the policy of Carteret, put himself at the head of a force of forty thousand men, the bulk of whom were English and Hanoverians, and marched from the Netherlands to the Main. His advance was checked and finally turned into a retreat by the Duc de Noailles, who appeared with a superior army on the south bank of the river,

d finally throwing thirty-one thousand men across it threatened to compel the King to surrender. In the battle of Dettingen which followed (June 27, 1743) the allied army was in fact only saved from destruction by the impetuosity of the French horse and the dogged obstinacy with which the English held their ground and at last forced their opponents to recross the Main. But small as was the victory, it produced amazing results. The French evacuated Germany. The English and Austrian armies appeared on the Rhine. In the spring of 1744 an Austrian army marched upon Naples, with the purpose of transferring it after its conquest to the Emperor, whose hereditary dominions in Bavaria were to pass in turn to Maria Theresa.

But if Frederick of Prussia had withdrawn from the war on the occasion of Silesia, he was resolute to take up arms again rather than suffer this great aggrandisement of the House of Austria. His sudden alliance with France failed at first to change the course of the war, for though he was successful in seizing Prague and drawing the Austrian army from the Rhine he was soon driven from Bohemia, while the death of the Emperor forced Bavaria to lay down its arms and to ally itself with Maria Theresa. So high were the Queen's hopes at this moment that she formed a secret alliance with Russia for the division of the Prussian monarchy. But in 1745 the tide turned. Marshal Saxe established the superiority of the French army in Flanders by his defeat of the Duke of Cumberland. Advancing with a force of English, Dutch, and Hanoverians to the relief of Tournay, the Duke on the 31st of May 1745 found the French covered by a line of fortified villages and redoubts with but a single narrow gap near the hamlet of Fontenoy. Into this gap, however, the English troops, formed in a dense column, doggedly thrust themselves in spite of a terrible fire; but at the moment when the day seemed won the French guns, rapidly concentrated on their front, tore the column in pieces and drove it back in a slow and orderly retreat. The blow was quickly followed up in June by the victory of Frederick at Hohenfriedburg which drove the Austrians from Silesia, and by a landing of Charles Edward, the son of the Old Pretender as James Stuart was called, on the coast of Scotland at the close of July. But defeat abroad and danger at home only quickened a political reaction which had begun long before in England. Even Carteret had been startled by the plan for a dismemberment of Prussia; and as early as 1744 the bulk of the Whig party had learnt the wisdom of the more temperate policy of Walpole, and had opened the way for an accommodation with Frederick by compelling Carteret to resign. The Pelhams, who represented Walpole's system, were now supreme, and their work was aided by the disasters of 1745. When England was threatened by a Catholic Pretender, it was no time for weakening the chief Protestant power in Germany. On the refusal therefore of Maria Theresa to join in a general peace, England concluded the convention of Hanover with Prussia at the close of August,

1742
1782

Fontenoy

1742 and withdrew so far as Germany was concerned from the
to war.
1762

—
Charles Edward The danger at home indeed had already vindicated Walpole's prudence in foiling the hopes of the Pretender by his steady friendship with France. It was only from France that aid could reach the Jacobites, and the war with France at once revived their hopes. Charles Edward, the grandson of James the Second, was placed by the French Government at the head of a formidable armament in 1744; but his plan of a descent on Scotland was defeated by a storm which wrecked his fleet, and by the march of the French troops which had embarked in it to the war in Flanders. In 1745, however, the young adventurer again embarked with but seven friends in a small vessel and landed on a little island of the Hebrides. For three weeks he stood almost alone; but on the 29th of August the clans rallied to his standard in Glenfinnan, and Charles found himself at the head of fifteen hundred men. His force swelled to an army as he marched through Blair Athol on Perth, entered Edinburgh in triumph, and proclaimed "James the Eighth" at the Town Cross. Two thousand English troops who marched against him under Sir John Cope were broken and cut to pieces on the 21st of September by a single charge of the clansmen at Preston Pans, and victory at once doubled the forces of the conqueror. The Prince was now at the head of six thousand men, but all were still Highlanders, for the people of the Lowlands held aloof from his standard. It was with the utmost difficulty that he could induce them to follow him to the south. His tact and energy however at last conquered all obstacles, and after skilfully evading an army gathered at Newcastle he marched through Lancashire and pushed on the 4th of December as far as Derby. But all hope of success was at an end. Hardly a man rose in his support as he passed through the districts where Jacobitism boasted of its strength. The people flocked to see his march as if to see a show. Catholics and Tories abounded in Lancashire, but only a single squire took up arms. Manchester was looked on as the most Jacobite of English towns, but all the aid it gave was an illumination and two thousand pounds. From Carlisle to Derby he had been joined by hardly two hundred men. The policy of Walpole had in fact secured England for the House of Hanover. The long peace, the prosperity of the country, and the clemency of the Government, had done their work. Jacobitism as a fighting force was dead, and even Charles Edward saw that it was hopeless to conquer England with five thousand Highlanders. He soon learnt too that forces of double his own strength were closing on either side of him, while a third army under the King and Lord Stair covered London. Scotland itself, now that the Highlanders were away, quietly renewed in all the districts of the Lowlands its allegiance to the House of Hanover. Even in the Highlands the Macleods rose in arms for King George, while the Gordons refused to stir, though roused by a small French force which landed at Montrose. To advance further south was

possible, and Charles fell rapidly back on Glasgow; but the reinforcements which he found there raised his army to nine thousand men, and he marched on the 23rd of January, 1746, on the English my under General Hawley which had followed his retreat and camped near Falkirk. Again the wild charge of his Highlanders on victory for the Prince, but victory was as fatal as defeat. The bulk of his forces dispersed with their booty to the mountains, and Charles fell sullenly back to the north before the Duke of Cumberland. On the 16th of April, the two armies faced one another on Culloden Moor, a few miles eastward of Inverness. The Highlanders still numbered six thousand men, but they were starving and dispirited. Cumberland's force was nearly double that of the Prince. Torn by the Duke's guns, the clansmen flung themselves on their old fashion on the English front; but they were received with a terrible fire of musketry, and the few that broke through the first line found themselves fronted by a second. In a few moments all was over, and the Highlanders a mass of hunted fugitives. Charles himself after strange adventures escaped to France. In England fifty of his followers were hanged, three Scotch lords, Lovat, Balmerino, and Kilmarnock, brought to the block, and forty persons of rank attainted by Act of Parliament. More extensive measures of repression were needful in the Highlands. The feudal tenures were abolished. The hereditary jurisdictions of the chiefs were bought up and transferred to the Crown. The urban, or garb of the clansmen, was forbidden by law. These measures, followed by a general Act of Indemnity, proved effective for their purpose. The dread of the clansmen passed away, and the Sheriff's writ soon ran through the Highlands with as little resistance as in the streets of Edinburgh.

On the Continent the war still lingered on, though its original purpose had disappeared. The victories of Maria Theresa in Italy were balanced by those of France in the Netherlands, where Marshal Mawhood inflicted on the English and Dutch the defeats of Roucoux and Lauffeld. The danger of Holland and the financial exhaustion of France at last brought about in 1748 the conclusion of a Peace at Aix-la-Chapelle, by which both parties restored their conquests; and with this peace the active work of the Pelham Ministry came to an end. Utter inaction settled down over political life, and turnpike bills or acts for the furtherance of trade engaged the attention of Parliament till the death of Henry Pelham in 1754. But abroad things were less quiet. The Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle was in fact a mere truce forced on the contending powers by sheer exhaustion. France was dreaming of far wider schemes for the humiliation of England. The troubled question of the trade with America had only been waived by Spain. The two powers of the House of Bourbon were still united by the Family Compact, and as early as 1752 the Queen of Hungary by a startling change of policy had secretly drawn to their alliance. Neither Maria Theresa nor Saxony in fact had ever really abandoned the design for the recovery of

1748
to
1762

Peace
of Aix-
la-Chap-
elle

1742
to
1762

Silesia and for a partition of Prussia. The jealousy which Russia entertained of the growth of a strong power in North Germany, brought the Czarina Elizabeth to promise aid to their scheme; and in 1755 the league of these three powers with France and Spain was silently completed. So secret were these negotiations that they had utterly escaped the notice of the Duke of Newcastle, the brother of Henry Pelham, and his successor in the direction of English affairs; but they were detected from the first by the keen eye of Frederick of Prussia, who found himself face to face with a line of foes which stretched from Paris to St. Petersburg.

The
Seven
Years'
War

The danger to England was hardly less. France appeared again on the stage with a vigour and audacity which recalled the days of Lewis the Fourteenth. The weakness and corruption of its government were hidden for the time by the daring scope of its plans and the ability of the agents it found to carry them out. The aims of France spread far beyond Europe. In India, a French adventurer was founding a French Empire, and planning the expulsion of the English merchants from their settlements along the coast. In America, France not only claimed the valleys of the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi, but forbade the English Colonists to cross the Alleghanies, and planted Fort Duquesne on the waters of the Ohio. The disastrous repulse of General Braddock, who had marched on this fort in 1755 with a small force of regulars and Colonial Militia, awoke even Newcastle to his danger; and the alliance between England and Prussia at the close of the year gave the signal for the Seven Years' War. No war has had greater results on the history of the world or brought greater triumphs to England; but few have had more disastrous beginnings. Newcastle was too weak and ignorant to rule without aid, and yet too greedy of power to purchase aid by sharing it with more capable men. His preparations for the gigantic struggle before him may be guessed from the fact that there were but three regiments fit for service in England at the opening of 1756. France on the other hand was quick in her attack. Port Mahon in Minorca, the key of the Mediterranean, was besieged by the Duke of Richelieu and forced to capitulate. To complete the shame of England, a fleet sent to its relief under Admiral Byng retreated before the French. In Germany Frederick had seized Dresden at the outset of the war, and forced the Saxon army to surrender; and in 1757 his victory at Prague made him master of Bohemia; but a defeat at Kolin drove him to retreat again into Saxony. In the same year the Duke of Cumberland, who had taken post on the Weser with an army of fifty thousand men for the defence of Hanover, fell back before a French army to the mouth of the Elbe, and engaged by the Convention of Kloster-Seven to disband his forces. A despondency without parallel in our history took possession of our coolest statesmen, and even the impassive Chesterfield cried in despair, "We are no longer a nation."

But the nation of which Chesterfield despaired was really on the

eve of its greatest triumphs, and the miserable incapacity of the Duke of Newcastle only called to the front the genius of William Pitt. Pitt was the grandson of a governor of Madras, who had entered Parliament in 1734 as member for one of his father's pocket boroughs, and had at once headed the younger "Patriots" in their attack on Walpole. His fiery spirit had been hushed in office during the "broad-bottom administration" which followed the Minister's fall, but the death of Henry Pelham again replaced him at the head of the opposition. The first disaster of the war drove Newcastle from office, and in November 1756 Pitt became Secretary of State; but in four months he was forced to resign, and Newcastle re-appointed. In July 1757 however, it was necessary to recall him. The failure of Newcastle's administration forced the Duke to a junction with his rival; and fortunately for their country, the character of the two statesmen made the compromise an easy one. For all that Pitt coveted, for the general direction of public affairs, the control of foreign policy, the administration of the war, Newcastle had neither capacity nor inclination. On the other hand, his skill in parliamentary management was unrivalled. If he knew little else, he knew better than any living man the price of every member and the intrigues of every borough. What he cared for was not the control of affairs, but the distribution of patronage and the work of corruption, and from this Pitt turned disdainfully away. "Mr. Pitt does everything," wrote Horace Walpole, "and the Duke gives everything. So long as they agree in this partition they may do what they please." Out of the union of these two strangely contrasted leaders, in fact, rose the greatest, as it was the last, of the purely Whig administrations. But its real power lay from beginning to end in Pitt himself. Poor as he was, for his income was little more than two hundred a year, and springing as he did from a family of no political importance, it was by sheer dint of genius that the young cornet of horse, at whose youth and inexperience Walpole had sneered, seized a power which the Whig houses had ever since the Revolution kept jealously in their grasp. His ambition had no petty aim. "I want to call England," he said as he took office, "out of that enervate state in which twenty thousand men from France can shake her." His call was soon answered. He at once breathed his own lofty spirit into the country he served, as he communicated something of his own grandeur to the men who served him. "No man," said a soldier of the time, "ever entered Mr. Pitt's closet who did not feel himself braver when he came out than when he went in." Ill-combined as were his earlier expeditions, many as were his failures, he roused a temper in the nation at large which made ultimate defeat impossible. "England has been a long time in labour," exclaimed Frederick of Prussia as he recognised a greatness like his own, "but she has at last brought forth a man."

It is this personal and solitary grandeur which strikes us most as Pitt and we look back to William Pitt. The tone of his speech and action his Age

1742
to
1762

William
Pitt

stands out in utter contrast with the tone of his time. In the midst of a society critical, polite, indifferent, simple even to the affectation of simplicity, witty and amusing but absolutely prosaic, cool of heart and of head, sceptical of virtue and enthusiasm, sceptical above all of itself, Pitt stood absolutely alone. The depth of his conviction, his passionate love for all that he deemed lofty and true, his fiery energy, his poetic imaginativeness, his theatrical airs and rhetoric, his haughty self-assumption, his pompousness and extravagance, were not more puzzling to his contemporaries than the confidence with which he appealed to the higher sentiments of mankind, the scorn with which he turned from a corruption which had till then been the great engine of politics, the undoubting faith which he felt in himself, in the grandeur of his aims, and in his power to carry them out. "I know that I can save the country," he said to the Duke of Devonshire on his entry into the Ministry, "and I know no other man can." The groundwork of Pitt's character was an intense and passionate pride; but it was a pride which kept him from stooping to the level of the men who had so long held England in their hands. He was the first statesman since the Restoration who set the example of a purely public spirit. Keen as was his love of power, no man ever refused office so often, or accepted it with so strict a regard to the principles he professed. "I will not go to Court," he replied to an offer which was made him, "if I may not bring the Constitution with me." For the corruption about him he had nothing but disdain. He left to Newcastle the buying of seats and the purchase of members. At the outset of his career Pelham appointed him to the most lucrative office in his administration, that of Paymaster of the Forces; but its profits were of an illicit kind, and poor as he was, Pitt refused to accept one farthing beyond his salary. His pride never appeared in loftier and nobler form than in his attitude towards the people at large. No leader had ever a wider popularity than "the great commoner," as Pitt was styled, but his air was always that of a man who commands popularity, not that of one who seeks it. He never bent to flatter popular prejudice. When mobs were roaring themselves hoarse for "Wilkes and liberty," he denounced Wilkes as a worthless profligate; and when all England went mad in its hatred of the Scots, Pitt haughtily declared his esteem for a people whose courage he had been the first to enlist on the side of loyalty. His noble figure, his flashing eye, his majestic voice, the fire and grandeur of his eloquence, gave him a sway over the House of Commons far greater than any other Minister has possessed. He could silence an opponent with a look of scorn, or hush the whole House with a single word. But he never stooped to the arts by which men form a political party, and at the height of his power his personal following hardly numbered half a dozen members.

His real strength, indeed, lay not in Parliament but in the people at large. His significant title of "the great commoner" marks a political revolution. "It is the people who have sent me here,"

Pitt boasted with a haughty pride when the nobles of the Cabinet opposed his will. He was the first to see that the long political inactivity of the public mind had ceased, and that the progress of commerce and industry had produced a great middle class, which no longer found its representatives in the legislature. "You have taught me," said George the Second when Pitt sought to save Byng by appealing to the sentiment of Parliament, "to look for the voice of my people in other places than within the House of Commons." It was this unrepresented class which had forced him into power. During his struggle with Newcastle the greater towns backed him with the gift of their freedom and addresses of confidence. "For weeks," laughs Horace Walpole, "it rained gold boxes." London stood by him through good report and evil report, and the wealthiest of English merchants, Alderman Beckford, was proud to figure as his political lieutenant. The temper of Pitt indeed harmonized admirably with the temper of the commercial England which rallied round him, with its energy, its self-confidence, its pride, its patriotism, its honesty, its moral earnestness. The merchant and the trader were drawn by a natural attraction to the one statesman of their time whose aims were unselfish, whose hands were clean, whose life was pure and full of tender affection for wife and child. But there was a far deeper ground for their enthusiastic reverence and for the reverence which his country has borne Pitt ever since. He loved England with an intense and personal love. He believed in her power, her glory, her public virtue, till England learnt to believe in herself. Her triumphs were his triumphs, her defeats his defeats. Her dangers lifted him high above all thought of self or party-spirit. "Be one people," he cried to the factions who rose to bring about his fall: "forget everything but the public! set you the example!" His glowing patriotism was the real spell by which he held England. Even the faults which chequered his character told for him with the middle classes. The Whig statesmen who preceded him had been men whose pride expressed itself in a marked simplicity and absence of pretence. Pitt was essentially an actor, dramatic in the cabinet, in the House, in his very office. He transacted business with his clerks in full dress. His letters to his family, genuine as his love for them was, are stilted and unnatural in tone. It was easy for the wits of his day to jest at his affectation, his pompous gait, the dramatic appearance which he made on great debates with his limbs swathed in flannel and his crutch by his side. Early in life Walpole sneered at him for bringing into the House of Commons "the gestures and emotions of the stage." But the classes to whom Pitt appealed were classes not easily offended by faults of taste, and saw nothing to laugh at in the statesman who was borne into the lobby amidst the tortures of the gout or carried into the House of Lords to breathe his last in a protest against national dishonour.

Above all Pitt wielded the strength of a resistless eloquence. The power of political speech had been revealed in the stormy debates

1742
to
1782

Pitt's
Elo-
quence

of the Long Parliament, but it was cramped in its utterance by the legal and theological pedantry of the time. Pedantry was flung off by the age of the Revolution, but in the eloquence of Somers and his rivals we see ability rather than genius, knowledge, clearness of expression, precision of thought, the lucidity of the pleader or the man of business, rather than the passion of the orator. Of this clearness of statement Pitt had little or none. He was no ready debater like Walpole, no speaker of set speeches like Chesterfield. His set speeches were always his worst, for in these his want of taste, his love of effect, his trite quotations and extravagant metaphors came at once to the front. That with defects like these he stood far above every orator of his time was due above all to his profound conviction, to the earnestness and sincerity with which he spoke. "I must sit still," he whispered once to a friend, "for when once I am up everything that is in my mind comes out." But the reality of his eloquence was transfigured by a glow of passion which not only raised him high above the men of his own day but set him in the front rank among the orators of the world. The cool reasoning, the wit, the common sense of his age made way for a splendid audacity, a large and poetic imagination, a sympathy with popular emotion, a sustained grandeur, a lofty vehemence, a command over the whole range of human feeling. He passed without an effort from the most solemn appeal to the gayest raillery, from the keenest sarcasm to the tenderest pathos. Every word was driven home by the grand self-consciousness of the speaker. He spoke always as one having authority. He was, in fact, the first English orator whose words were a power, a power not over Parliament only but over the nation at large. Parliamentary reporting was as yet unknown, and it was only in detached phrases and half-remembered outbursts that the voice of Pitt reached beyond the walls of St. Stephen's. But it was especially in these sudden outbursts of inspiration, in these brief passionate appeals, that the power of his eloquence lay. The few broken words we have of him stir the same thrill in our day which they stirred in the men of his own.

Pitt and
the War

But passionate as was Pitt's eloquence, it was the eloquence of a statesman, not of a rhetorician. Time has approved almost all his greater struggles, his defence of the liberty of the subject against arbitrary imprisonment under "general warrants," of the liberty of the press against Lord Mansfield, of the rights of constituencies against the House of Commons, of the constitutional rights of America against England itself. His foreign policy was directed to the preservation of Prussia, and Prussia has at last vindicated his foresight by the creation of Germany. We have adopted his plans for the direct government of India by the Crown, plans which when he proposed them were regarded as insane. Pitt was the first to recognize the liberal character of the Church of England, its "Calvinistic Creed and Popish Liturgy;" he was the first to sound the note of Parliamentary reform. One of his earliest measures

shows the generosity and originality of his mind. He quieted Scotland by employing its Jacobites in the service of their country and by raising Highland regiments among its clans. The selection of Wolfe and Amherst as generals showed his contempt for precedent and his inborn knowledge of men. There was little indeed in the military expeditions with which Pitt's Ministry opened to justify his fame. Money and blood were lavished on buccaneering descents upon the French coasts which did small damage to the enemy. But in Europe Pitt wisely limited himself to a secondary part. He recognized the genius of Frederick the Great, and resolved to give him a firm and energetic support. The Convention of Closter-Seven had almost reduced Frederick to despair. But the moment of Pitt's accession to power was marked on the King's part by the most brilliant display of military genius which the modern world had as yet seen. Two months after his repulse at Kolin he flung himself on a French army which advanced into the heart of Germany and annihilated it in the victory of Rossbach. Before another month had passed he hurried from the Saale to the Oder, and by a yet more signal victory at Leuthen cleared Silesia of the Austrians. But these prodigious efforts would have been useless but for the aid of Pitt. The English Minister poured subsidy upon subsidy into Frederick's exhausted treasury, while he refused to ratify the Convention of Closter-Seven, and followed the King's advice by setting the Prince of Brunswick at the head of the army on the Elbe.

1742
to
1762

The victory of Rossbach was destined to change the fortunes of Clive the world by bringing about the unity of Germany; but the year of Rossbach was the year of a victory hardly less important in the East. The genius and audacity of a merchant-clerk made a company of English traders the sovereigns of Bengal, and opened that wondrous career of conquest which has added the Indian peninsula, from Ceylon to the Himalayas, to the dominions of the British crown. The early intercourse of England with India gave little promise of the great fortunes which awaited it. It was not till the close of Elizabeth's reign, a century after Vasco de Gama had crept round the Cape of Good Hope and founded the Portuguese settlements on the Goa coast, that an East India Company was founded in London. The trade, profitable as it was, remained small in extent, and the three early factories of the Company were only gradually acquired during the century which followed. The first, that of Madras, consisted of but six fishermen's houses beneath Fort St. George; that of Bombay was ceded by the Portuguese as part of the dowry of Catherine of Braganza; while Fort William, with the mean village which has since grown into Calcutta, owes its origin to the reign of William the Third. Each of these forts was built simply for the protection of the Company's warehouses, and guarded by a few "sepahis," sepoy, or paid native soldiers; while the clerks and traders of each establishment were under the direction of a President and a Council. One of these clerks in the

1742
to
1762

middle of the eighteenth century was Robert Clive, the son of a small proprietor near Market Drayton in Shropshire, an idle dare-devil of a boy whom his friends had been glad to get rid of by packing him off in the Company's service as a writer to Madras. His early days there were days of wretchedness and despair. He was poor and cut off from his fellows by the haughty shyness of his temper, weary of desk-work, and haunted by home sickness. Twice he attempted suicide; and it was only on the failure of his second attempt that he flung down the pistol which baffled him with a conviction that he was reserved for higher things.

Dupleix A change came at last in the shape of war and captivity. As soon as the war of the Austrian Succession broke out the superiority of the French in power and influence tempted them to expel the English from India. Labourdonnais, the governor of the French colony of the Mauritius, besieged Madras, and at a later time its clerks and merchants were carried prisoners to Pondicherry. Clive was among these captives, but he escaped in disguise, and returning to the settlement threw aside his clerkship for an ensign's commission in the force which the Company was busily raising. For the capture of Madras had not only established the repute of the French arms, but had roused Dupleix, the governor of Pondicherry, to conceive plans for the creation of a French empire in India. When the English merchants of Elizabeth's day brought their goods to Surat, all India, save the south, had just been brought for the first time under the rule of a single great power by the Mogul Emperors of the line of Akbar. But with the death of Aurungzebe, in the reign of Anne, the Mogul Empire fell fast into decay. A line of feudal princes raised themselves to independence in Rajpootana. The lieutenants of the Emperor founded separate sovereignties at Lucknow and Hyderabad, in the Carnatic, and in Bengal. The plain of the Upper Indus was occupied by a race of religious fanatics called the Sikhs. Persian and Affghan invaders crossed the Indus, and succeeded even in sacking Delhi, the capital of the Moguls. Clans of systematic plunderers, who were known under the name of Mahrattas, and who were in fact the natives whom conquest had long held in subjection, poured down from the highlands along the western coast, ravaged as far as Calcutta and Tanjore, and finally set up independent states at Poonah and Gwalior. Dupleix skillfully availed himself of the disorder around him. He offered his aid to the Emperor against the rebels and invaders who had reduced his power to a shadow; and it was in the Emperor's name that he meddled with the quarrels of the states of Central and Southern India, made himself virtually master of the court of Hyderabad, and seated a creature of his own on the throne of the Carnatic. Trichinopoly, the one town which held out against this Nabob of the Carnatic, was all but brought to surrender when Clive, in 1751, came forward with a daring scheme for its relief. With a few hundred English and sepoy he pushed through a thunderstorm to the surprise of Arcot, the Nabob's capital, en-

trenched himself in its enormous fort, and held it for fifty days against thousands of assailants. Moved by his gallantry, the Mahrattas, who had never believed that Englishmen would fight before, advanced and broke up the siege; but Clive was no sooner freed than he showed equal vigour in the field. At the head of raw recruits who ran away at the first sound of a gun, and sepoys who hid themselves as soon as the cannon opened fire, he twice attacked and defeated the French and their Indian allies, foiled every effort of Dupleix, and razed to the ground a pompous pillar which the French governor had set up in honour of his earlier victories.

1742
to
1762

Recalled by broken health to England, Clive returned at the outbreak of the Seven Years' War to win for England a greater prize than that which his victories had won for it in the supremacy of the Carnatic. He had only been a few months at Madras when a crime whose horror still lingers in English memories called him to Bengal. Bengal, the delta of the Ganges, was the richest and most fertile of all the provinces of India. Its rice, its sugar, its silk, and the produce of its looms, were famous in European markets. Its Viceroy, like their fellow lieutenants, had become practically independent of the Emperor, and had added to Bengal the provinces of Orissa and Behar. Surajah Dowlah, the master of this vast domain, had long been jealous of the enterprise and wealth of the English traders; and, roused at this moment by the instigation of the French, he appeared before Fort William, seized its settlers, and thrust a hundred and fifty of them into a small prison called the Black Hole of Calcutta. The heat of an Indian summer did its work of death. The wretched prisoners trampled each other under foot in the madness of thirst, and in the morning only twenty-three remained alive. Clive sailed at the news with a thousand Englishmen and two thousand sepoys to wreak vengeance for the crime. He was no longer the boy-soldier of Arcot; and the tact and skill with which he met Surajah Dowlah in the negotiations by which the Viceroy strove to avert a conflict were sullied by the Oriental falsehood and treachery to which he stooped. But his courage remained unbroken. When the two armies faced each other on the plain of Plassey the odds were so great that on the very eve of the battle a council of war counselled retreat. Clive withdrew to a grove hard by, and after an hour's lonely musing gave the word to fight. Courage, in fact, was all that was needed. The fifty thousand foot and fourteen thousand horse who were seen covering the plain at daybreak on the 23rd of June, 1757, were soon thrown into confusion by the English guns, and broke in headlong rout before the English charge. The death of Surajah Dowlah enabled the Company to place a creature of its own on the throne of Bengal; but his rule soon became a nominal one. With the victory of Plassey began in fact the Empire of England in the East.

In Germany, the news of Rossbach called the French from the Elbe back to the Rhine in the opening of 1758. Ferdinand of Brunswick, reinforced with twenty thousand English soldiers, held them

Plassey

Minden

1742
to
1762

at bay during the summer, while Frederick, foiled in an attack on Moravia, drove the Russians back on Poland in the battle of Zorndorf. His defeat, however, by the Austrian General Daun at Hochkirch, proved the first of a series of terrible misfortunes. The year 1759 marks the lowest point of Frederick's fortunes. A fresh advance of the Russian army forced the King to attack it at Kunersdorf in August, and his repulse ended in the utter rout of his army. For the moment all seemed lost, for even Berlin lay open to the conqueror. A few days later the surrender of Dresden gave Saxony to the Austrians; and at the close of the year an attempt upon them at Plauen was foiled with terrible loss. But every disaster was retrieved by the indomitable courage and tenacity of the King, and winter found him as before master of Silesia and of all Saxony save the ground which Daun's camp covered. The year which marked the lowest point of Frederick's fortunes was the year of Pitt's greatest triumphs, the year of Minden and Quiberon and Quebec. France aimed both at a descent upon England and the conquest of Hanover, and gathered a naval armament at Brest, while fifty thousand men under Contades and Broglie united on the Weser. Ferdinand with less than forty thousand met them (August 1) on the field of Minden. The French marched along the Weser to the attack, with their flanks protected by that river and a brook which ran into it, and with their cavalry, ten thousand strong, massed in the centre. The six English regiments in Ferdinand's army fronted the French horse, and, mistaking their general's order, marched at once upon them in line, regardless of the batteries on their flank, and rolling back charge after charge with volleys of musketry. In an hour the French centre was utterly broken. "I have seen," said Contades, "what I never thought to be possible—a single line of infantry break through three lines of cavalry, ranked in order of battle, and tumble them to ruin!" Nothing but the refusal of Lord George Sackville to complete the victory by a charge of Ferdinand's horse saved the French from utter rout. As it was, their army again fell back broken on Frankfort and the Rhine. The project of an invasion of England met with the same success. Eighteen thousand men lay ready to embark on board the French fleet, when Admiral Hawke came in sight of it on the 20th of November, at the mouth of Quiberon Bay. The sea was rolling high, and the coast where the French ships lay was so dangerous from its shoals and granite reefs that the pilot remonstrated with the English admiral against his project of attack. "You have done your duty in this remonstrance," Hawke coolly replied; "now lay me alongside the French admiral." Two English ships were lost on the shoals, but the French fleet was ruined and the disgrace of Byng's retreat wiped away.

The Con-
quest of
Canada

It was not in the Old World only that the year of Minden and Quiberon brought glory to the arms of England. In Europe, Pitt had wisely limited his efforts to the support of Prussia, but across the Atlantic the field was wholly his own. The French dominion

1742
to
1762

n North America, which was originally confined to Cape Breton and Canada, had been pushed by the activity of the Marquis of Montcalm along the great chain of lakes towards the Ohio and the Mississippi. Three strong forts, that of Duquesne on the Ohio, that of Niagara on the St. Lawrence, and that of Ticonderoga on Lake Champlain, supported by a chain of less important posts, threatened to cut off the English colonies of the coast from any possibility of extension over the prairies of the West. Montcalm was gifted with singular powers of administration; he had succeeded in attaching the bulk of the Indian tribes from Canada as far as the Mississippi to the cause of his nation, and the value of their aid had been shown in the rout of the British detachment which General Braddock led against Fort Duquesne. But Pitt had no sooner turned his attention to American affairs than these desultory raids were superseded by a large and comprehensive plan of attack. A combined expedition under Amherst and Boscowen captured Louisburg in 1758, and reduced the colony of Cape Breton at the mouth of the St. Lawrence. The American militia supported the British troops in a vigorous campaign against the forts, and though Montcalm was able to repulse General Abercromby from Ticonderoga, a force from Philadelphia made itself master of Duquesne. The name of Pittsburg which was given to their new conquest still commemorates the enthusiasm of the colonists for the great Minister who first opened to them the West. The next year (1759) saw the evacuation of Ticonderoga before the advance of Amherst, and the capture of Fort Niagara after the defeat of an Indian force which marched to its relief. But Pitt had resolved not merely to foil the ambition of Montcalm but to destroy the French rule in America altogether; and while Amherst was breaking through the line of forts, an expedition under General Wolfe entered the St. Lawrence and anchored below Quebec. Pitt had discerned the genius and heroism which lay hidden beneath the awkward manner and the occasional gasconade of the young soldier of thirty-three whom he chose for the crowning exploit of the war, but for a while his sagacity seemed to have failed. No efforts could draw Montcalm from the long line of inaccessible cliffs which at this point borders the river, and for six weeks Wolfe saw his men wasting away in inactivity while he himself lay prostrate with sickness and despair. At last his resolution was fixed, and in a long line of boats the army dropped down the St. Lawrence to a point at the base of the Heights of Abraham, where a narrow path had been discovered to the summit. Not a voice broke the silence of the night save the voice of Wolfe himself, as he quietly repeated the stanzas of Gray's "Elegy in a Country Churchyard," remarking as he closed, "I had rather be the author of that poem than take Quebec." But his nature was as brave as it was tender; he was the first to leap on shore and to scale the narrow path where no two men could go abreast. His men followed, pulling themselves to the top by the help of bushes and the crags, and at daybreak on the 12th of

1742
to
1762

September the whole army stood in orderly formation before Quebec. Wolfe headed a charge which broke the lines of Montcalm, but a ball pierced his breast in the moment of victory. "They run," cried an officer who held the dying man in his arms—"I protest they run." Wolfe rallied to ask who they were that ran, and was told "the French." "Then," he murmured, "I die happy!" The fall of Montcalm in the moment of his defeat completed the victory, and the submission of Canada put an end to the dream of a French empire in America. In breaking through the line with which France had striven to check the westward advance of the English colonists Pitt had unconsciously changed the history of the world. His support of Frederick and of Prussia was to lead in our own day to the creation of a United Germany. His conquest of Canada, by removing the enemy whose dread knit the colonists to the mother country and by flinging open to their energies in the days to come the boundless plains of the West, laid the foundation of the United States.

SECTION II.—THE INDEPENDENCE OF AMERICA, 1761—1785

[*Authorities.*—For the American question, see Lecky, "History of England"; Fiske, "American Revolution," and the "Cambridge Modern History," vol. vii. For the English history of the period, in addition to works already mentioned, the correspondence of George III. with Lord North; the Grenville Papers; Burke's speeches and pamphlets, and the Letters of Junius. Erskine May, "Constitutional History," extends from 1760 onwards. For Warren Hastings, see Lyall's biography.]

History
and the
War

England had never played so great a part in the history of mankind as now. The year 1759 was a year of triumphs in every quarter of the world. In September came the news of Minden, and of a victory off Lagos. In October came tidings of the capture of Quebec. November brought word of the French defeat at Quiberon. "We are forced to ask every morning what victory there is," laughed Horace Walpole, "for fear of missing one." But it was not so much in the number as in the importance of its triumphs that the war stood and remains still without a rival. It is no exaggeration to say that three of its many victories determined for ages to come the destinies of the world. With that of Rossbach began the re-creation of Germany, its intellectual supremacy over Europe, its political union under the leadership of Prussia and its kings. With that of Plassey the influence of Europe told for the first time since the days of Alexander on the nations of the East. The world, in Burke's gorgeous phrase, saw "one of the races of the north-east cast into the heart of Asia new manners, new doctrines, new institutions." With the triumph of Wolfe on the Heights of Abraham began the history of the United States of America.

The progress of the American colonies from the time when the Puritan emigration added the four New England States,

Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut, and Rhode Island, and those of Maryland and Virginia had been slow, but it had never ceased. Settlers still came, though in smaller numbers, and two new colonies south of Virginia received from Charles the Second their name of the Carolinas. The war with Holland transferred to British rule the district claimed by the Dutch from the Hudson to the inner Lakes, and the country was at once granted by Charles to his brother, and received from him the name of New York. Portions were soon broken off from this vast territory to form the colonies of New Jersey and Delaware. In 1682 a train of Quakers followed William Penn across the Delaware into the heart of the primeval forest, and became a colony which recalled its founder and the woodlands in which he planted it in its name of Pennsylvania. A long interval elapsed before a new settlement, which received its title of Georgia from the reigning sovereign, George the Second, was established by General Oglethorpe on the Savannah as a refuge for English debtors and for the persecuted Protestants of Germany. Slow as this progress seemed, the colonies were really growing fast in numbers and in wealth. Their population at the accession of George the Third was little less than a million and a half, a fourth of the population of the mother country. Their wealth had risen even faster than their numbers. Half a million of slaves were employed in tilling the rice-fields of Georgia, the indigo fields of the Carolinas, and the tobacco plantations of Virginia. New York and Pennsylvania grew rich from corn-harvests and the timber trade. But the distinction between the Northern and Southern colonies was more than an industrial one. In the Southern States the prevalence of slavery produced an aristocratic spirit and favoured the creation of large estates. Even the system of entails had been introduced among the wealthy planters of Virginia, where many of the older English families found representatives in houses such as those of Fairfax and Washington. Throughout New England, on the other hand, the characteristics of the Puritans, their piety, their intolerance, their simplicity of life, their love of equality and tendency to democratic institutions, remained unchanged. In education and political activity New England stood far ahead of its fellow colonies, for the settlement of the Puritans had been followed at once by the establishment of a system of local schools which is still the glory of America. "Every township," it was enacted, "after the Lord hath increased them to the number of fifty householders, shall appoint one to teach all children to write and read; and when any town shall increase to the number of a hundred families, they shall set up a grammar school."

Great, however, as these differences were, and great as was to be their influence on American history, they were little felt as yet. In the main features of their outer organization the whole of the colonies stood fairly at one. In religious and in civil matters alike all of them contrasted sharply with the England at home. Religious tolerance had been brought about by a medley of religious faiths

1761
to
1785

The
Ameri-
can
Colonies

England
and the
Colonies

such as the world had never seen before. New England was still a Puritan stronghold. In Virginia the bulk of the settlers clung to the Episcopal Church. Roman Catholics formed a large part of the population of Maryland. Pennsylvania was a State of Quakers. Presbyterians and Baptists had fled from tests and persecutions to colonize New Jersey. Lutherans and Moravians from Germany abounded among the settlers of Carolina and Georgia. In such a chaos of creeds religious persecution or a uniform Church were equally impossible. There was the same real unity in the political tendency and organization of the States as in the religious. Whether the temper of the colony was democratic, moderate, or oligarchical, its form of government was pretty much the same. The original rights of the proprietor, the projector and grantee of the earliest settlement, had in most cases either ceased to exist or fallen into desuetude. The government of each colony lay in a House of Assembly elected by the people at large, with a Council sometimes elected, sometimes nominated by the Governor, and a Governor either elected, or appointed by the Crown, with whose appointment administrative interference on the part of the Government at home practically ended. The colonies were left by a happy neglect to themselves. It was wittily said at a later day, that "Mr. Grenville lost America because he read the American despatches, which none of his predecessors ever did." There was little room, indeed, for any interference within the limits of the colonies. Their privileges were secured by royal charters. Their Assemblies had the sole right of internal taxation, and exercised it sparingly. Walpole, like Pitt afterwards, set roughly aside the project for an American excise. "I have Old England set against me," he said, "by this measure, and do you think I will have New England too?" Even in matters of trade the supremacy of the mother country was far from being a galling one. There were some small import duties, but they were evaded by a well-understood system of smuggling. The restriction of trade with the colonies to Great Britain was more than compensated by the commercial privileges which the Americans enjoyed as British subjects. As yet, therefore, there was nothing to break the good will which the colonists felt towards the mother country, while the danger of French aggression drew them closely to it. Populous as they had become, the English settlements still lay mainly along the seaboard of the Atlantic. Only a few exploring parties had penetrated into the Alleghanies before the Seven Years' War; and Indian tribes wandered unquestioned along the lakes. It was by his success in winning over these tribes to an acknowledgment of the supremacy of France that Montcalm was drawn to the project of extending the French dominion over the broad plains of the Ohio and the Missouri from Canada to the Mississippi, and of cutting off the English colonies from all access to the West. The instinct of the settlers taught them that in such a project lay the death-blow of America's future greatness; the militia of the colonies

marched with Braddock to his fatal defeat, and shared with the troops of Amherst the capture of Duquesne. The name of "Pittsburg," which they gave to their prize, still recalls the gratitude of the colonists to the statesman whose genius had rolled away the danger which threatened their destinies.

1761
to
1785

But strong as the attachment of the colonists to the mother country seemed at this moment, there were keen politicians who saw in the very completeness of Pitt's triumph a danger to their future union. The presence of the French in Canada had thrown the colonies on the protection of Great Britain. With the conquest of Canada their need of this protection was removed. For the moment, however, all thought of distant result was lost in the nearer fortunes of the war. In Germany the steady support of Pitt alone enabled Frederick to hold out against the terrible exhaustion of his unequal struggle. His campaign of 1760 indeed was one of the grandest efforts of his genius. Foiled in an attempt on Dresden, he again saved Silesia by his victory of Liegnitz and hurled back an advance of Daun by a victory at Torgau; while Ferdinand of Brunswick held his ground as of old along the Weser. But even victories drained Frederick's strength. Men and money alike failed him. It was impossible for him to strike another great blow, and the ring of enemies again closed slowly round him. His one remaining hope lay in the firm support of Pitt, and triumphant as his policy had been, Pitt was tottering to his fall. The envy and resentment of his colleagues at his undisguised supremacy found an unexpected supporter in the young sovereign who mounted the throne on the death of his grandfather in 1760. For the first and last time, since the accession of the House of Hanover, England saw a king who was resolved to play a part in English politics; and the part which George the Third succeeded in playing was undoubtedly a memorable one. In ten years he reduced government to a shadow, and turned the loyalty of his subjects into disaffection. In twenty he had forced the colonies of America into revolt and independence, and brought England to the brink of ruin. Work such as this has sometimes been done by very great men, and often by very wicked and profligate men; but George was neither profligate nor great. He had a smaller mind than any English king before him save James the Second. He was wretchedly educated, and his natural taste was of the meanest sort. "Was there ever such stuff," he asked, "as Shakspeare?" Nor had he the capacity for using greater minds than his own by which some sovereigns have concealed their natural littleness. On the contrary, his only feeling towards great men was one of jealousy and hate. He longed for the time when "decrepitude or death" might put an end to Pitt, and even when death had freed him from "this rumpet of sedition," he denounced the proposal for a public monument as "an offensive measure to me personally." But dull and petty as his temper was, he was clear as to his purpose and obstinate in the pursuit of it. And his purpose was to rule.

George
the
Third

1761
to
1785

"George," his mother, the Princess of Wales, had continually repeated to him in youth, "George, be king." He called himself always "a Whig of the Revolution," and he had no wish to undo the work which he believed the Revolution to have done. His wish was not to govern against law, but simply to govern, to be freed from the dictation of parties and ministers, to be in effect the first minister of the State. How utterly incompatible such a dream was with the Parliamentary constitution of the country as it had received its final form from Sunderland we have already seen, but George was resolved to carry out his dream. And in carrying it out he was aided by the circumstances of the time. The defeat of Charles Edward and the later degradation of his life had worn away the thin coating of Jacobitism which clung to the Tories. They were ready again to take part in politics, and in the accession of a king who unlike his two predecessors was no stranger but an Englishman, who had been born in England and spoke English, they found the opportunity they desired. Their withdrawal from public affairs had left them untouched by the progress of political ideas since the Revolution of 1688, and they returned to invest the new sovereign with all the reverence which they had bestowed on the Stuarts. A "King's party" was thus ready made to his hand; but George was able to strengthen it by a vigorous exertion of the power and influence which was still left to the Crown. All promotion in the Church, all advancement in the army, a great number of places in the civil administration and about the court, were still at the King's disposal. If this vast mass of patronage had been practically usurped by the ministers of his predecessors, it was resumed and firmly held by George the Third; and the character of the House of Commons made patronage, as we have seen, a powerful engine in its management. George had one of Walpole's weapons in his hands, and he used it with unscrupulous energy to break up the party which Walpole had held so long together. He saw that the Whigs were divided among themselves by the factious spirit which springs from a long hold of power, and that they were weakened by the rising contempt with which the country at large regarded the selfishness and corruption of its representatives. More than thirty years before, Gay had quizzed the leading statesmen of the day on the public stage under the guise of highwaymen and pickpockets. "It is difficult to determine," said the witty playwright, "whether the fine gentlemen imitate the gentlemen of the road, or the gentlemen of the road the fine gentlemen." And now that the "fine gentlemen" were represented by hoary jobbers such as Newcastle, the public contempt was fiercer than ever, and men turned sickened from the intrigues and corruption of party to the young sovereign who aired himself in the character which Bolinbroke had invented of a Patriot King.

The
Peace of
Paris

Had Pitt and Newcastle held together, supported as the one was by the commercial classes and public opinion, the other by the Whig families and the whole machinery of Parliamentary manage-

ment, George must have struggled in vain. But the ministry was already disunited. The Whigs, attached to peace by the traditions of Walpole, dismayed at the enormous expenditure, and haughty with the pride of a ruling oligarchy, were in silent revolt against the war and the supremacy of the Great Commoner. It was against their will that Pitt rejected proposals of peace from France on the terms of a desertion of Prussia. In 1761 he urged a new war with Spain. He had learnt the secret signature of a fresh family compact between the two Bourbon Courts of Spain and France, and he proposed to anticipate the blow by a seizure of the treasure fleet from the Indies, by occupying the Isthmus of Panama, and attacking the Spanish dominions in the New World. His colleagues shrank from plans so vast and daring: and Newcastle was spurred to revolt by the King and backed in it by the rest of the Whigs. It was in vain that Pitt enforced his threat of resignation by declaring himself responsible to "the people," or that the Londoners hung after his dismissal from office on his carriage wheels, hugged his footman, and even kissed his horses. The fall of the great statesman in October changed the whole look of European affairs. "Pitt disgraced," wrote a French philosopher,—"it is worth two victories to us!" Frederick, on the other hand, was almost driven to despair. George saw in the great statesman's fall nothing but an opening for peace. He quickly availed himself of the weakness and unpopularity in which the ministry found itself involved after Pitt's departure to drive the Duke of Newcastle from office by a series of studied mortifications, and to place the Marquis of Bute at its head. Bute was a mere court favourite, with the abilities of a gentleman scholar, but he was willing to do the King's will, and the King's will was to end the war. Frederick, who still held his ground stubbornly against fate, was brought to the brink of ruin in the spring of 1762 by the withdrawal of the English subsidies. It was in fact only his wonderful resolution and the sudden change in the policy of Russia which followed on the death of his enemy the Czarina Elizabeth which enabled him to retire from the struggle in the Treaty of Hubertsberg, without the loss of an inch of territory. George and Lord Bute had already purchased peace at a very different price. With a shameless indifference to the national honour, they had even offered Silesia to Austria, and East Prussia to the Czarina, in return for a cessation of hostilities. Fortunately the issue of the truce with Spain saved England from such humiliation as this. Pitt's policy had been vindicated by a Spanish declaration of war three weeks after his fall; and the surrender of Cuba and the Philippines to a British fleet brought about the Peace of Paris in September 1763. England restored Martinique, the most important of her West Indian conquests, to France, and Cuba and the Philippines to Spain in return for the cession of Florida. Her real aims were in India and America. In the first the French abandoned all right to any military settlement: in the second they gave up Canada and Nova Scotia.

1761
to
1785

1761
to
1785

The
House
of Com-
mons

The anxiety which the young king showed for peace abroad sprang simply from his desire to begin the struggle for power at home. So long as the war lasted Pitt's return to office and the union of the Whigs under his guidance was an hourly danger. But with peace the king's hands were free. He could count on the dissensions of the Whigs, on the new-born loyalty of the Tories, on the influence of the Crown patronage which he had taken into his own hands; but what he counted on most of all was the character of the House of Commons. At a time when it had become all-powerful in the State, when government hung simply on its will, the House of Commons had ceased in any real and effective sense to represent the Commons at all. The changes in the distribution of seats which were called for by the natural shiftings of population and wealth since the days of Edward the First had been recognized as early as the Civil Wars; but the reforms of the Long Parliament were cancelled at the Restoration. From the time of Charles the Second to that of George the Third not a single effort had been made to meet the growing abuses of our parliamentary system. Great towns like Manchester or Birmingham remained without a member, while members still sat for boroughs which, like Old Sarum, had actually vanished from the face of the earth. The effort of the Tudor sovereigns to establish a Court party in the House by a profuse creation of boroughs, most of which were mere villages then in the hands of the Crown, had ended in the appropriation of these seats by the neighbouring landowners, who bought and sold them as they sold their own estates. Even in towns which had a real claim to representation, the narrowing of municipal privileges ever since the fourteenth century to a small part of the inhabitants, and in many cases the restriction of electoral rights to the members of the governing corporation, rendered their representation a mere name. The choice of such places hung simply on the purse or influence of politicians. Some were "the King's boroughs," others obediently returned nominees of the Ministry of the day, others were "close boroughs" in the hands of jobbers like the Duke of Newcastle, who at one time returned a third of all the borough members in the House. The counties and the great commercial towns could alone be said to exercise any real right of suffrage, though the enormous expense of contesting such constituencies practically left their representation in the hands of the great local families. But even in the counties the suffrage was ridiculously limited and unequal. Out of a population in fact of eight millions of English people, only a hundred and sixty thousand were electors at all.

The
House
and the
Crown

How far such a House was from really representing English opinion we see from the fact that in the height of his popularity Pitt could hardly find a seat in it. When he did find one, it was at the hands of a great borough-jobber, Lord Clive. Purchase was the real means of entering Parliament. Seats were bought and sold in the open market at a price which rose to four thousand pounds,

and we can hardly wonder that the younger Pitt cried indignantly a later time, "This House is not the representative of the People of Great Britain. It is the representative of nominal boroughs, of rotten and exterminated towns, of noble families, of wealthy individuals, of foreign potentates." The meanest motives naturally followed on a body returned by such constituencies, cut off from the influence of public opinion by the secrecy of Parliamentary proceedings, and yet invested with almost boundless authority. Newcastle had made bribery and borough-jobbing the base of the power of the Whigs. George the Third seized it in his turn as the base of a power he purposed to give to the Crown. The royal revenue was employed to buy seats and to buy votes. Day by day, George himself scrutinized the voting-list of the two Houses, and distributed rewards and punishments as members voted according to his will or no. Promotion in the civil service, preferment in the church, rank in the army was reserved for "the King's friends." Mansions and court places were used to influence debates. Bribery was employed on a scale never known before. Under Bute's ministry an office was opened at the Treasury for the bribery of members, and twenty-five thousand pounds are said to have been spent in a single day.

1761
15
1785

The result of these measures was seen in the tone of the very Parliament which had till now bowed beneath the greatness of Pitt. Fall of Bute The teeth of his denunciations the Peace was approved by a majority of five to one. "Now indeed my son is king!" cried the Princess Dowager. But the victory was far from being won yet. So long as the sentiment of the House of Commons had fairly presented that of the nation at large, England had cared little for its abuses or its corruption. But the defeat of the Great Commoner disclosed the existence of a danger of which it had never dreamed. The country found itself powerless in the face of a body which wielded the supreme authority in its name, but which utterly ceased to be its representative. It looked on helplessly while the King, by sheer dint of corruption, turned the House which was the guardian of public rights into a means of governing by his will. Parliament was the constitutional expression of public opinion, and now public opinion was without the means of uttering itself in Parliament. The natural result followed. The early years of George the Third were distinguished by a public discontent, by political agitation and disturbances, such as have never been known since. Bute found himself the object of a detestation so sudden and so universal in its outbreak as to force him to resign in 1763. The King, as frightened as his minister, saw that the time had not yet come for ruling by his own adherents alone, and appealed for aid to Pitt. But though he had been betrayed by Newcastle and his followers, Pitt saw clearly that without the support of the whole Whig party a minister would be, as Bute had been, a tool of the Crown; and he made the return of all its sections an office a condition of his own. George refused to comply with

1761
to
1785

terms which would have defeated his designs; and he was able to save himself from submission by skilfully using the division which was rending the Whig camp into two opposite forces. The bulk of it, with Lord Rockingham and the Cavendishes at its head, leant to Pitt and to the sympathy of the commercial classes. A smaller part, under George Grenville and the Duke of Bedford, retained the narrow and selfish temper of a mere oligarchy, in whom greed of power overmastered every other feeling. In an evil hour George threw himself on the support of the last.

Quarrel
with the
Press

Of what moment his choice had been he was soon to learn. With Grenville's ministry began the political power of the Press and the struggle with America. The opinion of the country no sooner found itself unrepresented in Parliament than it sought an outlet in the Press. We have already noted the early history of English journalism, its rise under the Commonwealth, the censorship which fettered it, and the removal of this censorship after the Revolution. Under the two first Georges, its progress was hindered by the absence of great topics for discussion, the worthlessness of its writers, and above all the political lethargy of the time. It was in fact not till the accession of George the Third that the impulse which Pitt had given to the national spirit and the rise of a keener interest in politics raised the Press into a political power. The new force of public opinion found in it a court of political appeal from the House of Commons. The journals became mouthpieces for that outburst of popular hatred which drove Lord Bute from office in the teeth of his unbroken majority. The *North Briton*, a journal written by John Wilkes, denounced the Peace with peculiar bitterness, and ventured for the first time to attack a minister by name. Wilkes was a worthless profligate, but he had a remarkable power of enlisting popular sympathy on his side, and by a singular irony of fortune he became the chief instrument in bringing about three of the greatest advances which our constitution has ever made. At a later time he woke the nation to a conviction of the need for Parliamentary reform by his defence of the rights of constituencies against the despotism of the House of Commons, and took the lead in the struggle which put an end to the secrecy of Parliamentary proceedings. The prosecution of his *North Briton* in 1764 first established the right of the Press to discuss public affairs. Wilkes was sent to prison on a "general warrant" from the Secretary of State. The legality of such a mode of arbitrary arrest by an officer of state on a warrant which did not name the person to be arrested or specify the papers to be seized was at once questioned, and no such warrant has ever been issued since. A writ of *habeas corpus* freed Wilkes from prison, but he was soon prosecuted for libel, and the House of Commons condemned the paper, which was still before the civil courts, as a "false, scandalous, and seditious libel." The House of Lords at the same time voted a pamphlet found among Wilkes's papers to be blasphemous, and advised a prosecution. Wilkes fled to France, and was soon expelled from the House of

ommons. But the assumption of an arbitrary judicial power by both Houses, and the system of terror which Grenville put in force against the Press by issuing two hundred injunctions against different journals, roused a storm of indignation throughout the country. Every street resounded with cries of "Wilkes and Liberty." Bold as he was, Grenville dared go no further; and six years later, the failure of the prosecution directed against an anonymous journalist named "Junius" for his Letter to the King established the right of the Press to criticize the conduct not of Ministers or Parliament only, but of the sovereign himself.

The same recklessness which was shown by Grenville in his struggle with the Press was shown in his struggle with the American colonies. Pitt had waged war with characteristic profusion and defrayed its expenses by enormous loans. The public debt now stood at a hundred and forty millions, and the first work of the Grenville Ministry was to make provision for the new burthens the nation had incurred. As the burthen had been partly incurred for the defence of the American colonies, Grenville resolved that the colonies should bear their share of it. He raised the import duties on colonial ports. To deal with external commerce was generally held to be an unquestioned right of the mother country: and irritated as they were by these changes, the colonists submitted to them. A far heavier blow was dealt at their commerce by the rigid enforcement of the laws which restricted colonial trade to British ports, and the suppression of the illicit trade which had grown up with the Spanish settlements. The measure was a harsh and unwise one, but it was legal, and could only be resented by a general edge to use no British manufactures. But the next scheme of the Minister, his proposal to introduce internal taxation within the bounds of the colony itself by reviving the scheme of an excise stamp duty which Walpole's good sense had rejected, was met by another spirit. Taxation and representation, the colonists held, went hand in hand. America had no representatives in the British Parliament. The representatives of the colonists met in their own Colonial Assemblies, and these were willing to grant supplies of a yet larger amount than a stamp-tax would produce. With this protest and offer they despatched Benjamin Franklin, who had risen from his position of a working printer in Philadelphia to high repute among scientific discoverers, as their agent to England. But his remonstrances only kindled Grenville's obstinacy, and the Stamp Act was passed in 1765. Franklin saw no other course for the colonies than submission, but submission was the last thing which the colonists dreamed of. The Northern and Southern States were drawn together by the new danger. The Assembly of Virginia was the first to formally deny the right of the British Parliament to meddle with internal taxation, and to demand the repeal of the act. Massachusetts not only adopted the denial and the demand on its own, but proposed a Congress of delegates from all the Colonial Assemblies to provide for common and united action. In

1761
to
1785

The
Stamp
Act

1781
to
1785

Repeal
of the
Stamp
Act

October 1765 this Congress met to repeat the protest and petition of Virginia.

For the moment this unexpected danger seemed to raise English politics out of the chaos of faction and intrigue into which they were sinking. Not only had the Ministry incurred the hatred of the people, but the arrogance of Grenville had earned the resentment of the King. George again offered power to William Pitt. But Pitt stood almost alone. The silence of Newcastle and the Rockingham party while the war and his past policy was censured in Parliament had estranged him from the only section of the Whigs which could have acted with him: and the one friend who remained to him, his brother-in-law, Lord Temple, refused to aid in an attempt to construct a Cabinet. The King had no resource but to turn to the Marquis of Rockingham and the Whig party which he headed, but Rockingham had hardly taken office in July 1765 when the startling news came from America that Congress had resolved on resistance. Its resolution had been followed by action. No sooner had the stamps for the new Excise arrived in Boston than they were seized and held in custody by the magistrates of the town. The news at once called Pitt to the front. As a Minister he had long since rejected a similar scheme for taxing the colonies. He had been ill and absent from Parliament when the Stamp Act was passed, but he adopted to the full the constitutional claim of America. He gloried in the resistance which was denounced in Parliament as rebellion. "In my opinion," he said, "this kingdom has no right to lay a tax on the colonies. . . . America is obstinate! America is almost in open rebellion! Sir, I rejoice that America has resisted. Three millions of people so dead to all the feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves would have been fit instruments to make slaves of the rest." His words determined the action of the timid Ministry, and in spite of the resistance of the King and the "King's friends" the Stamp Act was formally repealed in 1766. But the doctrine he had laid down was as formally repudiated by a Declaratory Act passed at the same time which asserted the supreme power of Parliament over the colonies "in all cases whatsoever."

The
Chatham
Ministry

From this moment the Ministry was unable to stand against the general sense that the first man in the country should be its ruler. Pitt's aim was still to unite the Whig party, and though forsaken by Lord Temple, he succeeded to a great extent in the administration which he formed in the summer of 1766. Rockingham indeed refused office, but the bulk of his fellow Ministers remained, and they were reinforced by the few friends who clung to Pitt. In his zeal to bring all parties together, even some of the Court party were admitted to minor offices in the administration, a step which won the warm approbation of the King as likely to destroy "all party distinctions." Never had the hopes of a wise and noble government been stronger, and never were they fated to be more signally foiled. The life of the Ministry lay in Pitt, in his immense popularity, and

command which his eloquence gave him over the House of Commons. His acceptance of the Earldom of Chatham removed him from the House of Lords, and for a while ruined the confidence his reputation for unselfishness had aided him to win. But from no vulgar ambition that Pitt laid down his title of the Commoner. It was the consciousness of failing strength made him dread the storms of debate, and in a few months death had become a certainty. A painful and overwhelming illness, the result of nervous disorganization, withdrew him from public life; and his withdrawal robbed his colleagues of all vigour or

1761
to
1785

The plans which Chatham had set on foot for the betterment of Ireland, the transfer of India from the Company

Crown, and the formation of a Northern Alliance with Prussia and Russia to balance the Family Compact of the House of Bourbon, were suffered to drop. The one aim of the Ministry

to exist. It sought strength by the readmission of George Grenville and the Bedford party to office, but this practical abandonment of the policy of Pitt was soon followed by the retirement of his friends and of the chief of the Rockingham Whigs. A series of changes which it is needless to recount in detail left it finally a joint Ministry of the worst faction of the Whigs and of the party which had been slowly gathering strength under the leadership of the King's friends. In spite however of the worthlessness and mediocrity of its members, this Ministry lasted under the able guidance of the Duke of Grafton and Lord North for seven years, from 1768 to the close of the American war.

Its strength lay in the disorganization of the Whig party and the support of the King. George the Third had at last reached

The
King's
Ministry

where Pitt was discredited and removed for a time from the stage. The Whigs under Rockingham were fatally divided both from him and from the Bedford party. If the Bedfords were again in office it was on the condition of doing the King's will. Their Parliamentary opponents lay in the Tories and the "King's friends," who looked for support to George himself. In the early days of the Ministry his influence was felt to be predominant. In its later and more disorganised days it was supreme, for Lord North, who became the head of the Ministry on Grafton's retirement in 1770, was the mere creature of the King. "Not only did he direct the Minister," an observer tells us, "in all important matters of foreign and domestic policy, but he instructed him as to the management of business in Parliament, suggested what motions should be made or not, and how measures should be carried. He reserved for himself all the patronage, he arranged the whole cast of the administration, settled the relative place and pretensions of the various orders of state, law officers, and members of the household, created and promoted the English and Scotch judges, appointed and displaced bishops and deans, and dispensed other preferments in the Church. He disposed of military governments, regiments, and commissions, and himself ordered the marching of troops. He

gave and refused titles, honours, and pensions." All this immense patronage was steadily used for the creation and maintenance of a party in both Houses of Parliament attached to the King himself; and its weight was seen in the dependence to which the new Ministry was reduced. George was in fact sole Minister during the eight years which followed; and the shame of the darkest hour of English history lies wholly at his door.

Again, as in 1763, the Government which he directed plunged at his instigation into a struggle with opinion at home and with the colonists of America. The attempt of the House of Commons to gag the Press and to transform itself into a supreme court of justice had been practically foiled. It now began the most daring attack ever made, by a body professing to be representative, on the rights of those whom it represented. In 1768 Wilkes returned from France and was elected member for Middlesex, a county the large number of whose voters made its choice a real expression of public opinion. The choice of Wilkes was in effect a public condemnation of the House of Commons. The Ministry shrank from a fresh struggle with the agitator, but the King was eager for the contest. "I think it highly expedient to apprise you," he wrote to Lord North, "that the expulsion of Mr. Wilkes appears to be very essential, and must be effected." The Ministers and the House of Commons bowed to his will. By his non-appearance in court when charged with libel Wilkes had become an outlaw, and he was now thrown into prison on his outlawry. Dangerous riots broke out in London and over the whole country; but the Government persevered. In 1769 the House of Commons expelled Wilkes as a libeller. He was at once re-elected by the shire of Middlesex. Violent and oppressive as the course of the House of Commons had been, it had as yet acted within its strict right, for no one questioned its possession of a right of expulsion. But the defiance of Middlesex led it now to go further. It resolved, "That Mr. Wilkes having been in this session of Parliament expelled the House, was and is incapable of being elected a member to serve in the present Parliament;" and it issued a writ for a fresh election. Middlesex answered this insolent claim to limit the free choice of a constituency by again returning Wilkes; and the House was driven by its anger to a fresh and more outrageous usurpation. It again expelled the member for Middlesex, and on his return for the third time by an immense majority, it voted that the candidate whom he had defeated, Colonel Luttrell, ought to have been returned, and was the legal representative of Middlesex. The Commons had not only limited at their own arbitrary discretion the free election of the constituency, but they had transferred its rights to themselves by seating Luttrell as member in defiance of the deliberate choice of Wilkes by the freeholders of Middlesex. The country at once rose indignantly against this violation of constitutional law. Wilkes was elected an Alderman of London; and the Mayor, Aldermen, and Livery petitioned the king to dissolve the Parliament. A remonstrance from London

Westminster said boldly that "there is a time when it is demonstrable that men cease to be representatives. That time is now arrived. The House of Commons do not represent the people." Junius, an anonymous writer, attacked the Government for its rancor and unscrupulousness as was their tone, its new power to the literature of the Press by their clearness of statement, the finish of their style, and the terrible force of their invective.

But the storm, however, beat idly on the obstinacy of the King. The King was prosecuted, and the petitions and remonstrances of the people were haughtily rejected. At the beginning of 1770 however a new power to the literature of the Press by their clearness of statement, the finish of their style, and the terrible force of their invective. storm, however, beat idly on the obstinacy of the King. The King was prosecuted, and the petitions and remonstrances of the people were haughtily rejected. At the beginning of 1770 however a new power to the literature of the Press by their clearness of statement, the finish of their style, and the terrible force of their invective.

1761
to
1785

Parliamentary
Reform

They shrank with haughty disdain from the popular movement in which public opinion was forced to express itself, and Chatham, while censuring its extravagance, deliberately encouraged it. It is from the quarrels between Wilkes and the House of Commons that we may date the influence of public meetings on politics. The gatherings of the Middlesex electors in his time were preludes to the great meetings of Yorkshire freeholders in which the question of Parliamentary reform rose into prominence; and it was in the movement for reform, and the formation of corresponding committees throughout the country for the purpose of promoting it, that the power of political agitation made itself felt. Political societies and clubs took their part in the agitation and organization of public opinion: and the spread of the agitation, as well as the influence which now began to be exerted by the appearance of vast numbers of men in support of the political movement, proved that Parliament would soon have to reckon with the sentiments of the people at large.

The press, an agent far more effective than popular agitation was now beginning to bring the force of public opinion to bear on Parliament. We have seen how much of the corruption of the House of Commons was sprang from the secrecy of Parliamentary proceedings, and how much the harder to preserve as the nation woke to a sense of interest in its own affairs. From the accession of the Georges the reports of the more important discussions began to be published under the title of "The Senate of Lilliput," and with the names or simple initials to denote the speaker. Obtained by shorthand and often merely recalled by memory, these reports were necessarily inaccurate; and their inaccuracy was eagerly seized on

Power
of the
Press

1761
to
1785

as a pretext for enforcing the rules which guarded the secrecy of proceedings in Parliament. In 1771 the Commons issued a proclamation forbidding the publication of debates; and six printers, who set it at defiance, were summoned to the bar of the House. One who refused to appear was arrested by its messenger; but the arrest at once brought the House into conflict with the magistrates of London. They set aside the proclamation as without legal force, released the printers, and sent the messenger to prison for an unlawful arrest. The House sent the Lord Mayor to the Tower, but the cheers of the crowds which followed him on his way told that public opinion was again with the Press, and the attempt to hinder its publication of Parliamentary proceedings dropped silently on his release at the next prorogation. Few changes of equal importance have been so quietly brought about. Not only was the responsibility of members to their constituents made constant and effective by the publication of their proceedings, but the nation itself was called in to assist in the deliberations of its representatives. A new and wider interest in its own affairs was roused in the people at large, and a new political education was given to it through the discussion of every subject of national importance in the Houses and the Press. Public opinion, as gathered up and represented on all its sides by the journals of the day, became a force in practical statesmanship, influenced the course of debates, and controlled in a closer and more constant way than even Parliament itself had been able to do the actions of the Government. The importance of its new position gave a weight to the Press which it had never had before. The first great English journals date from this time. With the *Morning Chronicle*, the *Morning Post*, the *Morning Herald*, and the *Times*, all of which appeared in the interval between the opening years of the American War and the beginning of the war with the French Revolution, journalism took a new tone of responsibility and intelligence. The hacks of Grub Street were superseded by publicists of a high moral temper and literary excellence; and philosophers like Coleridge or statesmen like Canning turned to influence public opinion through the columns of the Press.

George
III. and
America

But as yet these influences were feebly felt, and George the Third was able to set Chatham's protests disdainfully aside, and to plunge into a contest far more disastrous for the fortunes of England. In all the wretched chaos of the last few years, what had galled him most had been the one noble act which averted a war between England and her colonies. To the King the Americans were already "rebels," and the great statesman whose eloquence had made their claims irresistible was a "trumpet of sedition." George deplored, in his correspondence with Lord North, the repeal of the Stamp Act. "All men feel," he wrote, "that the fatal compliance in 1766 has increased the pretensions of the Americans to absolute independence." In America itself the news of the repeal had been received with universal joy, and taken as a close of the strife. But

h sides there remained a pride and irritability which only handling could have allayed; and in the present state of politics wise handling was impossible. No sooner had the Earl of Chatham removed him from any real share in public than the wretched administration which still bore his name decided the Assembly of New York on its refusal to provide for English troops, and resolved to assert British sovereignty by levying import duties of trivial amount at American ports. The Assembly of Massachusetts was dissolved on a trifling quarrel with its Governor, and Boston was occupied for a time by British soldiers. The remonstrances of the Legislatures of Massachusetts and Virginia, however, coupled with a fall in the funds, deterred the Ministers of the dangerous course on which they had embarked; and in 1769 the troops were withdrawn, and all duties, except on tea, abandoned. A series of petty quarrels went on between every colony between the popular Assemblies and the governors appointed by the Crown, and the colonists persevered in their agreement to import nothing from the mother country. For three years there was no prospect of serious strife. In 1770 the influence of George Washington allayed the irritation in Virginia. Massachusetts contented itself with quarrelling with its governor and refusing to buy tea so long as the duty was levied. Lord Grenville, though approving the retention of the tea question, abandoned all dream of further taxation. But British power was supreme, and the fixed purpose of the King was to take the first opportunity of undoing the "fatal compliance."

1761
to
1785

vial riot gave him the handle he wanted. He had insisted on the tea duty being retained when the rest were withdrawn, and in September 1773 the arrival of some English ships laden with tea produced fresh irritation in Boston, where the non-importation agreement was strictly enforced. A mob in the disguise of Indians boarded the vessels and flung their contents into the sea. The riot was deplored alike by the friends of America in England and by its own leading statesmen; and both Washington and Franklin were prepared to support the Government in its demand for redress. But the thought of the King was not of repression, and he set roughly aside the more conciliatory proposals of Lord North and his fellow-ministers. They were readily rejected as "frivolous and vexatious" a petition of the Assembly of Massachusetts for the dismissal of two public officers whose letters home advised the withdrawal of free institutions from the colonies. They now seized on the riot as a pretext for more rigorous measures. A bill introduced into Parliament in the spring of 1774 punished Boston by closing its port against all trade. Another punished the State of Massachusetts by withdrawing the liberties it had enjoyed ever since the Pilgrim Fathers landed on its soil. Its charter was altered. The choice of its governor was transferred from the people to the Crown, and the

The
Boston
Tea-
Ships

1761
to
1785

nomination of its judges was transferred to the Governor. In the Governor, too, by a provision more outrageous than even these, was vested the right of sending all persons charged with a share in the late disturbances to England for trial. To enforce these measures of repression troops were sent to America, and General Gage, the commander-in-chief there, was appointed Governor of Massachusetts. The King's exultation at the prospect before him was unbounded. "The die," he wrote triumphantly to his Minister, "is cast. The colonies must either triumph or submit." Four regiments would be enough to bring Americans to their senses. They would only be "lions while we are lambs." "If we take the resolute part," he decided solemnly, "they will undoubtedly be very meek." Unluckily, the blow at Massachusetts was received with anything but meekness. The jealousies between State and State were hushed by the sense that the liberties of all were in danger. If the British Parliament could cancel the charter of Massachusetts and ruin the trade of Boston, it could cancel the charter of every colony and ruin the trade of every port from the St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico. All, therefore, adopted the cause of Massachusetts; and all their Legislatures, save that of Georgia, sent delegates to a Congress which assembled on the 4th of September at Philadelphia. Massachusetts took a yet bolder course. Not a citizen would act under the new laws. Its Assembly met in defiance of the Governor, called out the militia of the State, and provided arms and ammunition for it. But there was still room for reconciliation. The resolutions of the Congress had been moderate; for Virginia was the wealthiest and most influential among the States who sent delegates; and Virginia under Washington's guidance, though resolute to resist the new measures of the Government, still clung to the mother country. At home, the merchants of London and Bristol pleaded loudly for reconciliation; and in January 1775 Chatham again came forward to avert the strife he had once before succeeded in preventing. With characteristic grandeur of feeling he set aside all half-measures or proposals of compromise. "It is not cancelling a piece of parchment," he insisted, "that can win back America: you must respect her fears and her resentments." The bill which he introduced in concert with Franklin provided for the repeal of the late Acts and for the security of the colonial charters, abandoned the claim to taxation, and ordered the recall of the troops. A colonial Assembly was directed to assemble and provide means by which America might contribute towards the payment of the public debt.

The
Independence of
America

The contemptuous rejection of Chatham's measure began the great struggle which ended eight years later in the severance of the American Colonies from the British Crown. The Congress of delegates from the Colonial Legislatures at once voted measures for general defence, ordered the levy of an army, and set George Washington at its head. No nobler figure ever stood in the forefront of a nation's life. Washington was grave and courteous in

lress; his manners were simple and unpretending; his silence and the serene calmness of his temper spoke of a perfect self-mastery; but there was little in his outer bearing to reveal the grandeur of soul which lifts his figure, with all the simple majesty of an ancient statue, out of the smaller passions, the meaner impulses of the world around him. What recommended him for command as yet was simply his weight among his fellow landowners of Virginia, and the experience of war which he had gained in service in Braddock's luckless expedition against Fort Duquesne. It was only as the weary fight went on that the colonists learnt to value by little the greatness of their leader, his clear judgment, his heroic endurance, his silence under difficulties, his calmness in the hour of danger or defeat, the patience with which he waited, the steadiness and hardness with which he struck, the lofty and serene sense of duty that never swerved from its task through resentment or jealousy, that never through war or peace felt the touch of a personal ambition, that knew no aim save that of guarding the freedom of his fellow countrymen, and no personal longing save that of returning to his own fireside when their freedom was secured. It was almost unconsciously that men learnt to cling to Washington with a trust and faith such as few other men have won, and to regard him with a reverence which still hushes us in the presence of his memory. Even America hardly recognized his real grandeur till after he set his seal on "the man first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his fellow countrymen." Washington, more than any of his fellow colonists, represented the clinging of the Virginian landowners to the mother country, and his acceptance of the compromise proved that even the most moderate among them had no other way now save in arms. The struggle opened with a skirmish between a party of English troops and a detachment of militia at Lexington, and in a few days twenty thousand colonists appeared before Boston. The Congress reassembled, declared the States to be represented "The United Colonies of America," and undertook the work of government. Meanwhile ten thousand fresh troops landed at Boston; but the provincial militia seized the neck of the round which joins it to the mainland, and though they were driven from the heights of Bunker's Hill which commanded the town, it was only after a desperate struggle in which their bravery put an end for ever to the taunts of cowardice which had been heaped against the colonists. "Are the Yankees cowards?" retorted the men of Massachusetts, as the first English attack was driven back baffled down the hill-side. But a far truer courage was shown in the stubborn endurance with which sixteen thousand raw militia-men, who gradually dwindled to ten, ill fed and ill armed, held out with but forty-five rounds of ammunition to each man, cooped up through the winter, under Washington's command, a force of ten thousand veterans in the lines of Boston till the spring of 1776 saw them withdraw from the city to New York, where the whole British army, largely reinforced by mercenaries from Germany,

1761
to
1785

1761
to
1785

was concentrated under General Howe. Meanwhile a raid of the American General Arnold nearly drove the British troops from Canada; and though his attempt broke down before Quebec, it showed that all hope of reconciliation was over. The colonies of the south, the last to join in the struggle, expelled their Governors at the close of 1775. This decisive step was followed by the great act with which American history begins, the adoption on the 4th of July, 1776, by the delegates in Congress of the Declaration of Independence. "We," ran its solemn words, "the representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, solemnly publish and declare that these United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, Free and Independent States."

Death of
Chatham

The triumph of the colonies was soon followed by suffering and defeat. Howe, an active general with a fine army at his back, cleared Long Island in August by a victory at Brooklyn; and Washington, whose army was weakened by withdrawals and defeat, and disheartened by the loyal tone of the State in which it was encamped, was forced to evacuate New York and New Jersey, and to fall back, first on the Hudson and then on the Delaware. The Congress prepared to fly from Philadelphia, and a general despair showed itself in cries of peace. But a well-managed surprise at Trenton, and a daring march on the rear of Howe's army at Princetown restored the spirits of Washington's men, and forced the English general in his turn to fall back on New York. The spring of 1777 opened with a combined effort for the suppression of the revolt. An army assembled in Canada under General Burgoyne marched by way of the Lakes to seize the line of the Hudson, and with help from the army at New York to cut off New England from her sister provinces. Howe meanwhile sailed up the Chesapeake, and marched on Philadelphia, the temporary capital of the United States and the seat of the Congress. The rout of his little army of seven thousand men at Brandywine forced Washington to abandon Philadelphia, and after a bold but unsuccessful attack on his victors at Germanstown to retire into winter quarters on the banks of the Schuylkill. The unconquerable resolve with which he nerved his handful of beaten and half-starved troops in their camp at Valley Forge to face Howe's army through the winter is the noblest of Washington's triumphs. But in the north the war had taken another colour. When Burgoyne appeared on the Upper Hudson he found the road to Albany barred by an American force under General Gates. The spirit of New England, which had grown dull as the war rolled away from its borders, quickened again at the news of invasion and of the outrages committed by the Indians whom Burgoyne employed among his troops. Its militia hurried from town and homestead to the camp; and after a fruitless attack on the American lines, Burgoyne saw himself surrounded on the heights of Saratoga. On the 13th of

ber he was compelled to surrender. The news of this terrible mity gave force to the words with which Chatham at the very of the surrender was pressing for peace. "You cannot conquer erica," he cried when men were glorying in Howe's successes.

I were an American as I am an Englishman, while a foreign p was landed in my country, I never would lay down my arms, er, never, never!" Then, in a burst of indignant eloquence he idered against the use of the Indian and his scalping-knife llies of England against her children. The proposals which tham brought forward might perhaps, in his hands, even yet e brought America and the mother country together. His plan one of absolute conciliation, and of a federal union between settlements and Great Britain which would have left the nies absolutely their own masters in all matters of internal ernment and linked only by ties of affection and loyalty to the eral body of the Empire. But it met with the same fate as his icious proposals. Its rejection was at once followed by the news aratoga, and by the yet more fatal news that the disaster had ed the Bourbon Courts to avenge the humiliation of the Seven rs' War. In February 1778 France concluded an alliance with States, and that of Spain followed after a year's delay. Even he minds of the Ministers themselves all hope of conquering erica had disappeared. The King indeed was as obstinate for as ever; and the country, stung by its great humiliation, sent en thousand men to the ranks of the army. But even the King's ence broke down before the general despair. Lord North ied through Parliament bills which conceded to America all she originally claimed. The Duke of Richmond and a large number ie Whigs openly advocated the acknowledgment of American pendence. If a hope still remained of retaining the friendship ie colonies and of baffling the efforts of France and Spain, it lay ord Chatham, and in spite of the King's resistance the voice of whole country called him back to power. But on the eve of eturn to office this last chance was shattered by the hand of h. The day for which George the Third only two years before longed was come. Broken with age and disease, the Earl was e to the House of Lords on the 7th of April, and uttered in a broken words his protest against the proposal to surrender erica. "His Majesty," he murmured, "succeeded to an Empire eat in extent as its reputation was unsullied. Seventeen years this people was the terror of the world." Then falling back in oon, he was borne home to die.

om the hour of Chatham's death England entered on a conflict enemies whose circle gradually widened till she stood single- led against the world. In 1778, France and Spain were leagued

Progress
of the
War

America against her. Their joint fleet of sixty ships rode the ers of the Channel, and threatened a descent on the English t. But dead as Chatham was, his cry woke a new life in land. "Shall we fall prostrate," he exclaimed with his last

1761
to
1785

breath, "before the House of Bourbon?" and the divisions which had broken the nation in its struggle with American liberty vanished at a threat of French invasion. The weakness of the Ministry was compensated by the heroic energy of the nation itself. For three years, from 1779 to 1782, General Elliot held against famine and bombardment the rock fortress of Gibraltar. Although a quarrel over the right of search banded Holland and the Courts of the North in an armed neutrality against her, and added the Dutch fleet to the number of her assailants, England held her own at sea. Even in America the fortune of the war seemed to turn. After Burgoyne's surrender the English generals had withdrawn from Pennsylvania, and bent all their efforts on the south where a strong Royalist party still existed. The capture of Charleston and the successes of Lord Cornwallis in 1780 were rendered fruitless by the obstinate resistance of General Greene; but the States were weakened by bankruptcy and unnerved by hopes of aid from France. Meanwhile the losses of England in the West were all but compensated by new triumphs in the East.

England
and
India

Since the day of Plassey, India had been fast passing into the hands of the merchant company whose traders but a few years before held only three petty factories along its coast. The victory which laid Bengal at the feet of Clive had been followed in 1760 by a victory at Wandewash, in which Colonel Coote's defeat of Lally, the French Governor of Pondicherry, established British supremacy over Southern India. The work of organization had soon to follow on that of conquest; for the tyranny and corruption of the merchant-clerks who suddenly found themselves lifted into rulers was fast ruining the province of Bengal; and although Clive had profited more than any other by the spoils of his victory, he saw that the time had come when greed must give way to the responsibilities of power. In 1765 he returned to India, and the two years of his rule were in fact the most glorious years in his life. In the teeth of opposition from every clerk and of mutiny throughout the army, he put down the private trading of the Company's servants and forbade their acceptance of gifts from the natives. Clive set an example of disinterestedness by handing over to public uses a legacy which had been left him by the prince he had raised to the throne of Bengal; and returned poorer than he went to face the storm his acts had roused among those who were interested in Indian abuses at home. His unsparing denunciations of the misgovernment of Bengal at last stirred even Lord North to interfere; and when the financial distress of the Company drove it for aid to Government, the grant of aid was coupled with measures of administrative reform. The Regulation Act of 1773 established a Governor-General and a Supreme Court of Judicature for all British possessions in India, prohibited judges and members of Council from trading, forbade any receipt of presents from natives, and ordered that every act of the Directors should be signified to the Government to be approved or disallowed. The

interest which had been aroused in the subject of India was in an investigation of the whole question of its administration a Committee of the House of Commons. Clive's own early acts were examined with unsparing severity. His bitter complaint in the Lords that, Baron of Plassey as he was, he had been arraigned as a sheep-stealer, failed to prevent the passing of resolutions which censured the corruption and treachery of the early days of British rule in India. Here, however, the justice of the House prevailed. When his accusers passed from the censure of Indian government to the censure of Clive himself, the memory of his past deeds won from the House of Commons a unanimous vote, "that Robert Lord Clive did at the same time render great and meritorious services to his country."

1761
to
1785

By the Act of 1773 Warren Hastings was named Governor-General of the three presidencies. Hastings was sprung of a noble family which had long fallen into decay, and poverty had driven him in boyhood to accept a writership in the Company's service. One, whose quick eye discerned his merits, drew him after Plassey into political life; and the administrative ability he showed, during the disturbed period which followed, raised him step by step to the post of Governor of Bengal. No man could have been better fitted to discharge the duties of the new office which the Government at home had created without a thought of its real greatness. Hastings was gifted with rare powers of organization and control. His first measure was to establish the direct rule of the Company over Bengal by abolishing the government of its native princes, which, though it had become nominal, hindered all plans for effective administration. The Nabob sank into a pensionary, and the Company's new province was roughly but efficiently organized. The lot of the clerks and traders about him Hastings formed that class of public servants which still remains the noblest product of British rule in India. The system of law and finance which he devised, faulty and imperfect as it necessarily was, was far superior to any that India had ever seen. Corruption he put down with as firm a hand as Clive's, but he won the love of the new "civilians" as he had the love of the Hindoos. Although he raised the revenue of Bengal and was able to send home every year a surplus of half a million to the Company, he did this without laying a fresh burden on the natives or losing their good will. His government was guided by an intimate knowledge of and sympathy with the people. At a time when their tongue was looked on simply as a medium of trade and business, Hastings was skilled in the languages of India, he was versed in native customs, and familiar with native feeling. We can hardly wonder that his popularity with the Bengalees was such as no later ruler has ever attained, or that after a century of great events Indian mothers still hush their infants with the name of Warren Hastings.

Warren
Hastings

With Hastings began the conscious and deliberate purpose of projecting India to the British Crown. As yet, though English

1761
to
1785

India
in the
Ameri-
can War

influence was great in the south, Bengal alone was directly in English hands. The policy of Warren Hastings looked forward to a time when England should be absolute mistress of the whole of Hindostan, from Ceylon to the Himalayas. For this he bound native princes, as in Oude or Berar, by treaties and subsidies, crushed without scruple every state which like that of the Rohillas seemed to afford a nucleus for resistance, and watched with incessant jealousy the growth of powers even as distant as the Sikhs. The American war surprised him in the midst of vast schemes which were to be carried out by later Governors, and hurried him into immediate action. The jealousy of France sought a counterpoise to the power of Britain in that of the Mahrattas, freebooters of Hindoo blood whose tribes had for a century past carried their raids over India from the hills of the western coast, and founded sovereignties in Guzerat, Malwa, and Tanjore. All were bound by a slight tie of subjection to the Mahratta chief who reigned at Poonah, and it was through this chieftain that the French envoys were able to set the whole confederacy in motion against the English presidencies. The danger was met by Hastings with characteristic swiftness of resolve. His difficulties were great. For two years he had been rendered powerless through the opposition of his Council; and when freed from this obstacle the Company pressed him incessantly for money, and the Crown more than once strove to recall him. His own general, Sir Eyre Coote, was miserly, capricious, and had to be humoured like a child. Censures and complaints reached him with every mail. But his calm self-command never failed. No trace of his embarrassments showed itself in his work. The war with the Mahrattas was pressed with a tenacity of purpose which the blunders of subordinates and the inefficiency of the soldiers he was forced to use never shook for a moment. Failure followed failure, and success had hardly been wrung from fortune when a new and overwhelming danger threatened from the south. A military adventurer, Hyder Ali, had built up a compact and vigorous empire out of the wreck of older principalities on the table-land of Mysore. Tyrant as he was, no native rule was so just as Hyder's, no statesmanship so vigorous. He was quickwitted enough to discern the real power of Britain, and only the wretched blundering of the Council of Madras forced him at last to the conclusion that war with the English was less dangerous than friendship with them. Old as he was, his generalship retained all its energy; and a disciplined army, covered by a cloud of horse and backed by a train of artillery, poured down in 1780 on the plain of the Carnatic. The small British force which met him was driven into Madras, and Madras itself was in danger. The news reached Hastings when he was at last on the verge of triumph over the Mahrattas; but his triumph was instantly abandoned, a peace was patched up, and every soldier hurried to Madras. The appearance of Eyre Coote checked the progress of Hyder, and in 1781 the victory of Porto Novo hurled him back into the fastnesses of Mysore. India was

one quarter of the world where Britain lost nothing during the American war; and though the schemes of conquest which Hastings had formed were for the moment frustrated, the annexation of the Marathas, the extension of British dominions along the Ganges, the reduction of Oude to virtual dependence, the appearance of English armies in Central India, and the defeat of Hyder, laid the foundation of an Indian Empire which his genius was bold enough to foresee.

1761
to
1785

But while England triumphed in the East, the face of the war in America was changed by a terrible disaster. Foiled in an attempt to take North Carolina by the refusal of his fellow general, Sir H. Clinton, to assist him, Lord Cornwallis fell back in 1781 on Virginia, and entrenched himself in the lines of York Town. A sudden march of Washington brought him to the front of the English troops at a moment when the French fleet held the sea, and the army of Cornwallis was driven by famine to a surrender as humiliating as that of Saratoga. The news fell like a thunderbolt on the wretched minister who had till now suppressed at his master's order his own conviction of the uselessness of further bloodshed. Opening his windows and pacing wildly up and down his room, Lord North exclaimed "It is all over," and resigned. England in fact seemed to be on the brink of ruin. Even Ireland turned on her. A force of Protestant Volunteers which had been raised for the defence of the island, and had rapidly grown to a hundred thousand men, demanded the repeal of Poyning's Act and the recognition of the Irish House of Lords as a final Court of Appeal. The demand was to effect a claim of Irish independence; but there was no means of resisting it, for England was destitute of any force which she could oppose to the Volunteers. The hopes of her enemies rose high. Spain refused peace at any other price than the surrender of Gibraltar. France proposed that England should give up all her Indian conquests save Bengal. But at this moment the victories of Admiral Rodney, the greatest of English seamen save Nelson and Drake, saved the country from a dishonourable peace. He entered the Spanish fleet off Cape St. Vincent, and only four of the French vessels escaped to Cadiz. The triumphs of the French Admiral Grasse called him to the West Indies, and on the 12th April, 1782, a manœuvre which he was the first to introduce broke his opponent's line and drove the French fleet, shattered, from the scene.

The final repulse of the allied armament before Gibraltar in September ended the war. In November the Treaties of Paris and Versailles, while yielding nothing to France and only Minorca and Malta to Spain, acknowledged without reserve the Independence of America.

End of
the War

1783
to
1789

SECTION III.—THE SECOND PITT, 1783—1789

[*Authorities.*—To Lecky's "History of England" may be added Stanhope's "Life of Pitt"; Trevelyan's "C. J. Fox"; the "Annual Register"; and Prior's "Life of Burke," and Burke's own works. For the slave trade, see the "Memoirs of Wilberforce," by his sons. For the general condition of foreign affairs, see Sorel, "L'Europe et la Révolution Française," and the "Cambridge Modern History."]

England
and the
World

The larger and world-wide issues of the establishment of American Independence lie beyond the scope of the present work, nor can we dwell here on the political and social influence which America has exercised ever since on the mother country itself. What startled men most at the time was the discovery that England was not ruined by the loss of her colonies or by the completeness of her defeat. She rose from it indeed stronger and greater than ever. The next ten years saw a display of industrial activity such as the world had never witnessed before. During the twenty which followed she wrestled almost single-handed against the energy of the French Revolution, as well as against the colossal force of Napoleonic tyranny, and came out of the one struggle unconquered and out of the other a conqueror. Never had England stood higher among the nations of the old world than after Waterloo; but she was already conscious that her real greatness lay not in the old world but in the new. From the moment of the Declaration of Independence it mattered little whether England counted for less or more with the nations around her. She was no longer a mere European power, no longer a mere rival of Germany or Russia or France. She was from that hour a mother of nations. In America she had begotten a great people, and her emigrant ships were still to carry on the movement of the Teutonic race from which she herself had sprung. Her work was to be colonization. Her settlers were to dispute Africa with the Kaffir and the Hottentot, to wrest New Zealand from the Maori, to sow on the shores of Australia the seeds of great nations. And to these nations she was to give not only her blood and her speech, but the freedom which she had won. It is the thought of this which flings its grandeur round the pettiest details of our story in the past. The history of France has little result beyond France itself. German or Italian history has no direct issue outside the bounds of Germany or Italy. But England is only a small part of the outcome of English history. Its greater issues lie not within the narrow limits of the mother island, but in the destinies of nations yet to be. The struggles of her patriots, the wisdom of her statesmen, the steady love of liberty and law in her people at large, were shaping in the past of our little island the future of mankind.

The
Rock-
ingham
Ministry

At the time, however, when this work first became visible in the severance of America, the wisdom of English statesmen seemed at its lowest ebb. The fall of Lord North in March 1782 recalled the Whigs to office; and though the Tories had now grown to a com-

1783
to
1789

at body of a hundred and fifty members, the Whigs still remained superior to their rivals in numbers and ability as in distinctness of political aim. The return, too, of the Bedford section of their party, well as its steady opposition to the American war, had restored much of its early cohesion. But the return of this aristocratic and cautious section only widened the breach which was slowly opening, questions such as that of Parliamentary reform, between the bulk of the Whig party and the small fragment which remained true to the more popular sympathies of Lord Chatham. Lord Shelburne was named as the head of the Chatham party, and it was reinforced at this moment by the entry into Parliament of the second son of its earliest leader. William Pitt had hardly reached his twenty-second year; but he left college with the learning of a ripe scholar, and his ready and sonorous eloquence had been matured by the teaching of Chatham. "He will be one of the first men in Parliament," said a member to the Whig leader, Charles Fox, after Pitt's first speech in the House of Commons. "He is so already," replied Fox. His figure, tall and spare, but without grace, showed even now in every movement the pride which was written on the hard lines of his countenance never lighted by a smile, a pride which broke out in his cold and repulsive address, his invariable gravity of demeanour, and his habitual air of command. How great the qualities which lay beneath this haughty exterior no one knew; nor did any one guessed how soon this "boy," as his rivals mockingly called him, was to crush every opponent and to hold England at will. There was only a smile of wonder when he refused any of the minor offices which were offered him in the new Whig Administration, which in spite of the King's reluctance was formed on the advice of Lord North under the Marquis of Rockingham.

Lord Rockingham fell the duty of putting an end at any cost to the misgovernment of Ireland was satisfied by the repeal of the Act of George the Third which declared the right of the Parliament of Great Britain to legislate for the Irish people; and negotiations were begun with France and its allies. But more important even than the work of peace was that of putting an end to those abuses in the composition of Parliament by which George the Third had been enabled to mismanage the country into war. A thorough reform of the House of Commons was the only effectual means of doing this, and Pitt brought forward a bill founded on his father's plans for that purpose. The Whigs could not resolve on the sacrifice of property and principle which such a reform would involve. Pitt's bill was thrown out, and in its stead the Ministry endeavoured to weaken the influence of the House of Commons by disqualifying persons holding government contracts from sitting in Parliament, by depriving revenue officers of the elective franchise (a measure which diminished the influence of the Crown in twenty boroughs), and above all by a bill for the reduction of the civil establishment, of the pension list, and of the secret service list, which was introduced by Burke. These measures were to a

Econo-
mical
Reform

1783
to
1789

great extent effectual in diminishing the influence of the Crown over Parliament, and they are memorable as marking the date when the direct bribery of members absolutely ceased. They were absolutely inoperative in rendering the House of Commons really representative of or responsible to the people of England. But the jealousy which the mass of the Whigs entertained for the Chatham section and its plans was more plainly shown on the death of Lord Rockingham in July. Shelburne was no sooner called to the head of the Ministry than Fox with his immediate followers resigned. Pitt on the other hand accepted office as Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The
Coalition

The Shelburne Ministry only lasted long enough to conclude the Peace of Paris; for in the opening of 1783 it was overthrown by the most unscrupulous coalition known in our history, that of the Whig followers of Fox with the Tories who still clung to Lord North. Secure in their Parliamentary majority, and heedless of the power of public opinion without the walls of the House of Commons, the new Ministers entered boldly on a greater task than had as yet taxed the constructive genius of English statesmen. To leave such a dominion as Warren Hastings had built up in India to the control of a mere company of traders was clearly impossible; and Fox proposed to transfer the political government from the Directors of the Company to a board of seven Commissioners. The appointment of the seven was vested in the first instance in Parliament, and afterwards in the Crown; their office was to be held for five years, but they were removable on address from either House of Parliament. The proposal was at once met with a storm of opposition. The scheme was an injudicious one; for the new Commissioners would have been destitute of that practical knowledge of India which belonged to the Company, while the want of any immediate link between them and the actual Ministry of the Crown would have prevented Parliament from exercising a real control over their acts. But these objections to the India Bill were hardly heard in the popular outcry against it. The merchant-class was galled by the blow levelled at the greatest merchant-body in the realm: corporations trembled at the cancelling of a charter; the King viewed the measure as a mere means of transferring the patronage of India to the Whigs. With the nation at large the real fault of the bill lay in the character of the Ministry which proposed it. The Whigs had a second time rejected Pitt's proposal of Parliamentary reform; but their coalition with North showed that in an unreformed Parliament the force of public opinion was unable to check the most shameless efforts of political faction. The power of the Crown had been diminished by the reforms of Lord Rockingham to the profit, not of the people, but of the borough-mongers who usurped its representation. To give the rule and patronage of India over to the existing House of Commons was to give a new and immense power to a body which misused in the grossest way the power it possessed. It was the sense of this popular feeling

rich encouraged the King to exert his personal influence to defeat a measure in the Lords, and on its defeat to order his Ministers deliver up the seals. In December 1783 Pitt accepted the post of First Lord of the Treasury; but his position would at once have been untenable had the country gone with its nominal representatives. He was defeated again and again by large majorities in the Commons; but the majorities dwindled as a shower of addresses came from every quarter, from the Tory University of Oxford as from the Whig Corporation of London, proved that public opinion went with the Minister and not with the House. It was the general sense of this which justified Pitt in the firmness with which, in the teeth of addresses for his removal from office, he delayed the dissolution of Parliament for five months, and gained time for that ripening of opinion on which he counted for success. When the elections of 1784 came the struggle was at once at an end. The public feeling had become strong enough for the moment to break through the corrupt influences which generally made representation a farce. Every great constituency returned supporters to Pitt; of the majority which had defeated him in the Commons a hundred and twenty members were unseated; and only a fragment of the Whig party was saved by its command of nomination boroughs.

India owes to Pitt's triumph a form of government which remained unchanged to our own day. The India Bill which he introduced in 1784 preserved in appearance the political and commercial powers of the Directors, while establishing a Board of Control, formed from members of the Privy Council, for the approval or annulling of their acts. Practically, however, the powers of the Board of Directors were absorbed by a secret committee of three elected members of that body, to whom all the more important administrative functions had been reserved by the bill, while those of the Board of Control were virtually exercised by its President. As the President was in effect a new Secretary of State for the Indian Department, and became an important member of his Ministry, responsible like his fellow-members for his action to Parliament, the administration of India was thus made a part of the general system of the English Government; while the secret committee supplied the practical experience of Indian affairs in which the Minister might be deficient. But a far more important change than any which could be wrought by legislative measures took place at this time in the attitude of England itself towards its dependency. The discussions over the rival India Bills created a sense of national responsibility for its good government. There was a general resolve that the security against injustice and rule which was enjoyed by the poorest Englishman should be enjoyed by the poorest Hindoo; and this resolve expressed itself in 1786 in the trial of Warren Hastings. Hastings returned from India at the close of the war with the hope of rewards as great as those Clive had received. He had saved all that Clive had gained. He had laid the foundation of a vast empire in the East. He had shown rare powers

1783
to
1789

The
Trial of
Hastings

1783
to
1789

of administration, and the foresight, courage, and temperance which mark the real rulers of men. But the wisdom and glory of his rule could not hide its terrible ruthlessness. To glut the ceaseless demands of the Company at home, to support his wars, to feed his diplomacy, he had needed money; and he took it wherever he could find it. He sold for a vast sum the services of British troops to crush the free tribes of the Rohillas. He wrung half a million by oppression from the Rajah of Benares. He extorted by torture and starvation more than a million from the Princesses of Oude. Nor was this all. He had retained his hold upon power by measures hardly less unscrupulous. At the opening of his career, when he was looked upon as helpless before his enemies in the Council, he had shown his power by using the forms of English law to bring Nuncomar, a native who chose the party opposed to him, to death as a forger. When Sir Elijah Impey, the first Chief Justice of Bengal, stood in the way of his plans, he bribed him into acquiescence by creating a fictitious and well-paid office in his favour. It was true that the hands of the Governor-General were clean, and that he had sought for power from no selfish motive, but from a well-grounded conviction that his possession of power was necessary for the preservation of India to the British Crown. But even Pitt shrank from justifying his acts when Burke, in words of passionate eloquence, moved his impeachment. The great trial lingered on for years, and in the long run Hastings secured an acquittal. But the end at which the impeachment aimed had really been won. The crimes which sullied the glory of Hastings have never been repeated by the worst of his successors. From that day to this the peasant of Bengal or of Mysore has enjoyed the same rights of justice and good government as are claimed by Englishmen.

William
Pitt

The refusal, in spite of pressure from the King, to shelter Hastings when he had once convinced himself that Hastings was unjust, marked the character of William Pitt. At the moment when the new Parliament came together after the overthrow of the Coalition, the Minister of twenty-five seemed master of England as no Minister had been before. Even the King yielded to his sway, partly through gratitude for the triumph he had won for him over the Whigs, partly from a sense of the madness which was soon to strike him down. The Whigs were broken, unpopular, and without a policy. The Tories clung to the Minister who had "saved the King." All that the trading classes had loved in Chatham, his nobleness of temper, his consciousness of power, his patriotism, his sympathy with a wider world than the world within the Parliament-House, they saw in William Pitt. He had little indeed of the poetic and imaginative side of Chatham's genius, of his quick perception of what was just and what was possible, his far-reaching conceptions of national policy, his outlook into the future of the world. Pitt's flowing and sonorous commonplaces rang hollow beside the broken phrases which still make his father's eloquence a living thing to Englishmen. On the other hand he possessed some

lities in which Chatham was utterly wanting. His temper, though naturally ardent and sensitive, had been schooled in a proud command. His simplicity and good taste freed him from his father's ostentation and extravagance. Diffuse and commonplace as his speeches seem, they were adapted as much by their very diffuseness and commonplace, as by their lucidity and common sense, to the intelligence of the middle classes whom Pitt felt to be his real audience. In his love of peace, his immense industry, his despatch of business, his skill in debate, his knowledge of the world, he recalled Sir Robert Walpole; but he had virtues which Walpole never possessed, and he was free from Walpole's worst defects. He was careless of personal gain. He was too proud to be corrupted by corruption. His lofty self-esteem left no room for any flattery of subordinates. He was generous in his appreciation of the merits of others; and the "boys" he gathered round him, such as Lord Shelburne and Lord Wellesley, rewarded his generosity by a devotion to his death left untouched. With Walpole's cynical inaction Pitt had no sympathy whatever. His policy from the first was one of reform, and he faced every one of the problems, financial, constitutional, religious, from which Walpole had shrunk. Above all he had none of Walpole's scorn of his fellow-men. The noblest feature in his mind was its wide humanity. His love for England was as deep and personal as his father's love, but of the sympathy

for England and English prejudice which had been at once his father's weakness and strength he had not a trace. When Fox reproached him with forgetting Chatham's jealousy of France and his father's belief that she was the natural foe of England, Pitt answered nobly

"to suppose any nation can be unalterably the enemy of another is weak and childish." The temper of the time and the sympathy of man with man, which especially marks the eighteenth century as a turning-point in the history of the human race, was everywhere bringing to the front a new order of statesmen, such as Turgot and Joseph the Second, whose characteristics were a love of mankind, and a belief that as the happiness of the individual can only be secured by the general happiness of the community to which he belongs, so the welfare of individual nations can only be secured by the general welfare of the world. These Pitt was one. But he rose high above the rest in the depth of his knowledge and the practical force which he brought to the realization of his aims.

His strength lay in finance; and he came forward at a time when the growth of English wealth made a knowledge of finance vital to a great Minister. The progress of the nation itself was wonderful. Population more than doubled during the eighteenth century, and the advance of wealth was even greater than that of population. The war had added a hundred millions to the national debt, but the burden was hardly felt. The loss of America only checked the commerce with that country. Industry began that career which was to make England the workshop of the world.

1783
to
1789

During the first half of the century the cotton trade, of which Manchester was the principal seat, had only risen from the value of twenty to that of forty thousand pounds; and the hand-loom retained the primitive shape which is still found in the hand-loom of India. But three successive inventions in ten years, that of the spinning-machine in 1768 by the barber Arkwright, of the spinning-jenny in 1764 by the weaver Hargreaves, of the mule by the weaver Crompton in 1776, turned Lancashire into a hive of industry. At the accession of George the Third the whole linen trade of Scotland was of less value than the cloth trade of Yorkshire. Before the close of his reign Glasgow was fast rising into one of the trading capitals of the world. The potteries which Wedgewood established in 1763, and in which he availed himself of the genius of Flaxman, soon eclipsed those of Holland or France. Before twenty years had passed more than twenty thousand potters were employed in Staffordshire alone. This rapid growth of manufactures brought about a corresponding improvement in the means of communication throughout the country. Up to this time these had been of the rudest sort. The roads were for the most part so wretched that all cheap or rapid transit was impossible; and the cotton bales of Manchester were carried to Liverpool or Bristol on packhorses. One of the great works of this period was the covering England with a vast network of splendid highways. But roads alone could not meet the demands of the new commerce. The engineering genius of Brindley joined Manchester with its port of Liverpool in 1761 by a canal which crossed the Irwell on a lofty aqueduct; and the success of the experiment soon led to the universal introduction of water-carriage. Canals linked the Trent with the Mersey, the Thames with the Trent, the Forth with the Clyde. The cheapness of the new mode of transit as well as the great advance in engineering science brought about a development of English collieries which soon gave coal a great place among our exports. Its value as a means of producing mechanical force was revealed in the discovery by which Watt in 1765 transformed the Steam Engine from a mere toy into the most wonderful instrument which human industry has ever had at its command. The same energy was seen in the agricultural change which passed gradually over the country. Between the first and the last years of the eighteenth century a fourth part of England was reclaimed from waste and brought under tillage. At the Revolution of 1688 more than half the kingdom was believed to consist of moorland and forest and fen; and vast commons and wastes covered the greater part of England north of the Humber. But the numerous enclosure bills which began with the reign of George the Second and especially marked that of his successor changed the whole face of the country. Ten thousand square miles of untilled land have been added under their operation to the area of cultivation; while in the tilled land itself the production had been more than doubled by the advance of agriculture which began with the travels and treatises of Arthur Young, the introduction

the system of large farms by Mr. Coke of Norfolk, and the development of scientific tillage in the valleys of Lothian.

If books are to be measured by the effect which they have produced on the fortunes of mankind, the "Wealth of Nations" must rank among the greatest of books. Its author was Adam Smith, an Oxford scholar and a professor at Glasgow. Labour, he contended, is the one source of wealth, and it was by freedom of labour, by offering the worker to pursue his own interest in his own way, that the public wealth would best be promoted. Any attempt to force labour into artificial channels, to shape by laws the course of commerce, to promote special branches of industry in particular countries, or to fix the character of the intercourse between one country and another, is not only a wrong to the worker or the merchant, but actually hurtful to the wealth of a state. The book was published in 1776, in the opening of the American war, and read by Pitt during his career as an undergraduate at Cambridge. At that time he owned Adam Smith for his master. He had hardly become Minister before he took the principles of the "Wealth of Nations" as the groundwork of his policy. The ten earlier years of his rule marked a new point of departure in English statesmanship. Pitt was the first English Minister who really understood the part which industry was to play in promoting the future of the world. He was not only a peace Minister and a financier, as Walpole had been, but a statesman who saw that the best security for peace lay in the freedom and widening of commercial intercourse between nations; that public economy not only lessened the general burdens but left additional capital in the hands of industry; and that finance might be turned from a mere means of raising revenue into a powerful engine of political and social improvement.

That little was done by Pitt himself to carry these principles into effect was partly owing to the mass of ignorance and prejudice with which he had to contend, and still more to the sudden break of plans through the French Revolution. His power rested above all on the trading classes, and these were still persuaded that although meant gold and silver, and that commerce was best furthered by jealous monopolies. It was only by patience and dexterity that the mob of merchants and country squires who backed him in the House of Commons could be brought to acquiesce in the changes proposed. How small his power was when it struggled with the prejudices around him was seen in the failure of the first great measure he brought forward. The question of parliamentary reform had been mooted, as we have seen, during the American war. Chatham had advocated an increase of county members, who were then the most independent part of the Lower House. The Duke of Richmond talked of universal suffrage, equal electoral districts, and annual Parliaments. Wilkes anticipated the Reform Bill of a later time by proposing to disfranchise the rotten boroughs, and to give members in their stead to the counties and to the more

1783
to
1789

Adam
Smith

Pitt and
Reform

1783
to
1789

populous and wealthy towns. William Pitt had made the question his own by bringing forward a motion for reform on his first entry into the House, and one of his first measures as Minister was to bring in a bill in 1785 which, while providing for the gradual extinction of all decayed boroughs, disfranchised thirty-six at once, and transferred their members to counties. He brought the King to abstain from opposition, and strove to buy off the borough-mongers, as the holders of rotten boroughs were called, by offering to compensate them for the seats they lost at their market-value. But the bulk of his own party joined the bulk of the Whigs in a steady resistance to the bill. The more glaring abuses, indeed, within Parliament itself, the abuses which stirred Chatham and Wilkes to action, had in great part disappeared. The bribery of members had ceased. Burke's Bill of Economical Reform had dealt a fatal blow at the influence which the King exercised by suppressing a host of useless offices, household appointments, judicial and diplomatic charges, which were maintained for the purpose of corruption. Above all, the recent triumph of public opinion had done much to diminish the sense of any real danger from the opposition which Parliament had shown till now to the voice of the nation. "Terribly disappointed and beat" as Wilberforce tells us Pitt was by the rejection of his measure, the temper of the House and of the people was too plain to be mistaken, and though his opinion remained unaltered, he never brought it forward again.

Pitt's
Finance

The failure of his constitutional reform was more than compensated by the triumphs of his finance. When he entered office public credit was at its lowest ebb. The debt had been doubled by the American war, yet large sums still remained unfunded, while the revenue was reduced by a vast system of smuggling which turned every coast-town into a nest of robbers. The deficiency was met for the moment by new taxes, but the time which was thus gained served to change the whole face of public affairs. The first of Pitt's financial measures—his revival of the plan for gradually paying off the debt by a sinking fund which Walpole had thrown aside—was undoubtedly an error; but it had a happy effect in restoring public confidence. He met the smuggler by a reduction of custom-duties which made his trade unprofitable. He revived Walpole's plan of an Excise. Meanwhile the public expenses were reduced, and commission after commission was appointed to introduce economy into every department of the public service. The rapid development of the national industry which we have already noted no doubt aided the success of these measures. Credit was restored. The smuggling trade was greatly reduced. In two years there was a surplus of a million, and though duty after duty was removed the revenue rose steadily with every remission of taxation. Meanwhile Pitt was showing the political value of the new finance. France was looked upon as England's natural enemy. Ireland, then as now, was England's difficulty. The tyrannous misgovernment under which she had groaned ever since the battle

the Boyne was producing its natural fruit; the miserable land was torn with political faction, religious feuds and peasant conspiracies; and so threatening had the attitude of the Protestant party which ruled it become during the American war that they had forced the English Parliament to relinquish its control over the Irish Parliament in Dublin. Pitt saw that much at least of the misery and disloyalty of Ireland sprang from its poverty. The population had grown rapidly while culture remained stationary and commerce perished. And of this poverty much was the direct result of unjust law. Ireland was a grazing country, but to protect the interest of English graziers the import of its cattle into England was forbidden. To protect the interests of English clothiers and weavers, its manufactures were loaded with duties. To redress this wrong was the first financial effort of Pitt, and the bill which he introduced in 1785 did away with every obstacle to freedom of trade between England and Ireland. It was a measure which, as

he held, would "draw what remained of the shattered empire together," and repair in part the loss of America by creating a rich and prosperous Ireland; and though he struggled almost alone in face of a fierce opposition from the Whigs and the Manchester merchants, he dragged it through the English Parliament, only to see it flung aside by the Protestant faction under Grattan which then ruled the Parliament of Ireland. But the defeat only spurred him to a greater effort elsewhere; and his Treaty of Commerce with France in 1787 enabled the subjects of both countries to reside and travel in either without license or passport, did away with all prohibition of trade on either side, and reduced every port duty. But the spirit of humanity which breathed through these measures of commercial freedom soon took a larger scope. The trial of Warren Hastings was rousing England to a more vivid sympathy with the Hindoo; and in the year which followed the adoption of free trade with France the new philanthropy allied itself with the religious spirit created by the Wesleys in an attack on the Slave Trade. At the Peace of Utrecht the privilege of carrying negroes from the coast of Africa to sell them as labourers in the American colonies and the West Indian islands had been counted among the gains which England reaped from the war with Lewis; but the horrors and iniquity of the trade, the ruin and degradation of the native tribes which it brought about, and above all the oppression of the negro himself, were now felt widely and deeply. After a conversation in the open air at the foot of an old tree at Woodstock, just above the steep descent into the vale of Keston," Pitt encouraged his friend William Wilberforce, whose position as a Parliamentary representative of the Evangelical party gave weight to his advocacy of such a cause, to bring in a bill for the abolition of the Slave Trade. In spite of Pitt's ardent support, the bill of 1788 fell before the opposition of the Liverpool slave-merchants and the general indifference of the House. But the great movement of which it formed a part was now passing on the other

1783
to
1789

side of the Channel into a revolution which was to change the face of the world.

State of
Europe

The Puritan resistance of the seventeenth century had in the end succeeded in checking, so far as England was concerned, the general tendency of the time to religious and political despotism. Since the Revolution of 1688 freedom of conscience and the people's right to govern itself through its representatives in Parliament had been practically established. Social equality had begun long before. Every man from the highest to the lowest was subject to, and protected by, the same law. The English aristocracy, though exercising a powerful influence on government, were possessed of few social privileges, and prevented from forming a separate class in the nation by the legal and social tradition which counted all save the eldest son of a noble house as commoners. No impassable line parted the gentry from the commercial classes, and these again possessed no privileges which could part them from the lower classes of the community. After a short struggle, public opinion, the general sense of educated Englishmen, had established itself as the dominant element in English government. But in all the other great states of Europe the wars of religion had left only the name of freedom. Government tended to a pure despotism. Privilege was supreme in religion, in politics, in society. Society itself rested on a rigid division of classes from one another, which refused to the people at large any equal rights of justice or of industry. We have already seen how alien such a conception of national life was from the ideas which the wide diffusion of intelligence during the eighteenth century was spreading throughout Europe; and in almost every country some enlightened rulers endeavoured by administrative reforms in some sort to satisfy the sense of wrong which was felt around them. The attempts of sovereigns like Frederick the Great in Prussia and Joseph the Second in Austria and the Netherlands were rivalled by the efforts of statesmen such as Turgot in France. It was in France indeed that the contrast between the actual state of society and the new ideas of public right was felt most keenly. Nowhere had the victory of the Crown been more complete. The aristocracy had been robbed of all share in public affairs; it enjoyed social privileges and exemption from any contribution to the public burdens without that sense of public duty which a governing class to some degree always possesses. Guilds and monopolies at once fettered the industry of the trader and the merchant and cut them off from the working classes, as the value attached to noble blood cut both off from the aristocracy.

State of
France

If its political position indeed were compared with that of most of the countries round it, France stood high. Its government was less oppressive and more influenced by public opinion, its general wealth was larger and more evenly diffused, there was a better administration of justice, and greater security for public order. Poor as its peasantry seemed to English eyes they were far above

1783
to
1789

peasants of Germany or Spain. Its middle class was the richest and most intelligent in Europe. Opinion under Lewis the sixteenth was practically free, though powerless to influence the government of the country; and a literary class had sprung up which devoted itself with wonderful brilliancy and activity to popularizing the ideas of social and political justice which it learned from English writers, and in the case of Montesquieu and Voltaire from personal contact with English life. The moral convictions of the time, its love of mankind, its sense of human brotherhood, its hatred of oppression, its pity for the guilty and the poor, longing after a higher and nobler standard of life and action, were expressed by a crowd of writers, and above all by Rousseau, with a fire and eloquence which carried them to the heart of the people. Everywhere the new force of intelligence jostled roughly with the social forms with which it found itself in contact. The philosopher denounced the tyranny of the priesthood. The peasant rebelled at the lord's right to judge him in his courts and to exact feudal services from him. The merchant was galled by the trading restrictions and the heavy taxation. The country gentry rebelled against their exclusion from public life and from the government of the country. Its powerlessness to bring about any change at once turned all the new energy into sympathy with a struggle against tyranny abroad. Public opinion forced France to ally itself with America in its contest for liberty, and French volunteers under Marquis de Lafayette joined Washington's army. But while war spread more widely throughout the nation the craving for freedom, it brought on the Government financial embarrassment from which it could only free itself by an appeal to the country at large. Lewis the Sixteenth resolved to summon the Estates-General, which had not met since the time of Richelieu, and to appeal to the nobles to waive their immunity from taxation.

The Estates-General resolve at once stirred into vigorous life every impulse and desire which had been seething in the minds of the people; and the Estates-General no sooner met at Versailles in May 1789 than the edifice of despotism and privilege began to crumble. A rising in Paris destroyed the Bastille, and the capture of this fortress was taken as the sign of a new era of constitutional freedom for France and for Europe. Everywhere men thrilled with a strange joy at tidings of its fall. "How much is this the greatest event that has happened in the world," Fox cried with a burst of enthusiasm; "and how much the best!"

It regarded the approach of France to sentiments of liberty which had long been familiar to England with characteristic coolness, but with no distrust. For the moment, indeed, his attention was distracted by an attack of madness which visited the King in 1793, and by the claim of a right to the Regency which was at once advanced by the Prince of Wales. The Prince belonged to the Whig party; and Fox, who was travelling in Italy, hurried home to support his claim in full belief that the Prince's Regency would be

Pitt and
Russia

1783
to
1789

followed by his own return to power. Pitt successfully resisted it on the constitutional ground that in such a case the right to choose a temporary regent, under what limitations it would, lay with Parliament; and a bill which conferred the Regency on the Prince, in accordance with this view, was already passing the Houses when the recovery of the King put an end to the long dispute. Abroad, too, Pitt's difficulties were increasing. Russia had risen into greatness under Catherine the Second; and Catherine had resolved from the first on the annexation of Poland, the expulsion of the Turks from Europe, and the setting up of a Russian throne at Constantinople. In her first aim she was baffled for the moment by Frederick the Great. She had already made herself virtually mistress of the whole of Poland, her armies occupied the kingdom, and she had seated a nominee of her own on its throne, when Frederick in union with the Emperor Joseph the Second forced her to admit Germany to a share of the spoil. If the first Polish partition of 1773 brought the Russian frontier westward to the upper waters of the Dwina and the Dnieper, it gave Galicia to Maria Theresa, and West Prussia to Frederick himself. Foiled in her first aim, she waited for the realization of her second till the alliance between the two German powers was at an end through the resistance of Prussia to Joseph's schemes for the annexation of Bavaria, and the death of Frederick removed her most watchful foe. Then in 1788 Joseph and the Empress joined hands for a partition of the Turkish Empire. But Prussia was still watchful, and England was no longer fettered as in 1773 by troubles with America. The friendship established by Chatham between the two countries, which had been suspended by Bute's treachery and all but destroyed during the Northern League of Neutral Powers, had been restored by Pitt through his co-operation with Frederick's successor in the restoration of the Dutch Statholderate. Its political weight was now seen in the alliance of England, Prussia, and Holland in 1789 for the preservation of the Turkish Empire. A great European struggle seemed at hand; and in such a struggle the sympathy and aid of France was of the highest importance. But with the treaty the danger passed away. In the spring of 1790 Joseph died broken-hearted at the failure of his plans and the revolt of the Netherlands against his innovations; and Austria practically withdrew from the war with the Turks.

Burke Meanwhile in France things moved fast. By breaking down the division between its separate orders the States-General became a National Assembly, and abolished the privileges of the provincial parliaments, of the nobles, and the Church. In October the mob of Paris marched on Versailles and forced both King and Assembly to return with them to the capital; and a Constitution, hastily put together, was accepted by Lewis the Sixteenth in the stead of his old despotic power. To Pitt, the tumult and disorder with which these great changes were wrought seemed transient matters. In January 1790 he still believed that "the present convulsions in France must sooner or later culminate in general harmony and

gular order," and that when her own freedom was established, France would stand forth as one of the most brilliant powers of Europe." But the coolness and good-will with which Pitt looked on the Revolution was far from being universal in the nation at large. The cautious good sense of the bulk of Englishmen, their love of order and law, their distaste for violent changes and for abstract theories, as well as their reverence for the past, were fast rousing throughout the country a dislike of the revolutionary changes which were hurrying on across the Channel. That the dislike passed slowly into fear and hatred was due above all to the impassioned efforts of Edmund Burke. Forty years before, Burke had come to London as a poor and unknown Irish adventurer. The learning which made him at once the friend of Johnson and Reynolds, and the imaginative power which enabled him to give his learning a living shape, promised him a philosophical and literary career: but instinct drew Burke to politics; he became secretary to Lord Rockingham, and in 1765 entered Parliament under his patronage. His speeches on the Stamp Acts and the American War soon lifted him into fame. The heavy Quaker-like figure, the little wig, the round spectacles, the cumbrous roll of paper which loaded Burke's pocket, gave little promise of a great orator and less of the characteristics of his oratory,—its passionate colour, its poetic fancy, its amazing prodigality of resources; the dazzling succession in which irony, pathos, invective, tenderness, the most brilliant word-pictures, the coolest argument followed each other. It was an eloquence indeed of a wholly new order in English experience. Walpole's clearness of statement, Chatham's appeals to emotion, were exchanged for the impassioned expression of a distinct philosophy of politics. "I have learned more from him than from all the books I ever read," Fox exclaimed with a burst of generous admiration. The philosophical cast of Burke's reasoning was unaccompanied by any philosophical coldness of tone or phrase. The groundwork indeed of his nature was poetic. His ideas, if conceived by the reason, took shape and colour from the splendour and fire of his imagination. A nation was to him a great living society, so complex in its relations, and whose institutions were so interwoven with glorious events in the past, that to touch it rudely was a sacrilege. Its constitution was no artificial scheme of government, but an exquisite balance of social forces which was in itself a natural outcome of its history and development. In the Revolution of 1688 Burke saw the fated close of a great æra of national progress which had moved on "from precedent to precedent." His temper was in this way conservative, but his conservatism sprang not from a love of inaction but from a sense of the value of social order, and from an imaginative reverence for all that existed. Every institution was hallowed to him by the clear insight with which he discerned its relations to the state and its subtle connexion with the social fabric around it. To touch even an anomaly seemed to Burke to be risking the ruin of a

1783
to
1789

1788
to
1789

complex structure or national order which it had cost centuries to build up. "The equilibrium of the Constitution," he said, "has something so delicate about it, that the least displacement may destroy it." "It is a difficult and dangerous matter even to touch so complicated a machine." Perhaps the readiest refutation of such a theory was to be found in its influence on Burke's practical dealing with politics. It left him hostile to all movement whatever. He gave his passionate adhesion to the helpless inaction of the Whigs. He made an idol of Lord Rockingham, an honest man, but the weakest of party leaders. He strove to check the corruption of Parliament by his bill for civil retrenchment, but he took the lead in defeating all plans for its reform. Though he was the one man in England who understood with Pitt the value of free industry, he struggled bitterly against the young Minister's proposals to give freedom to Irish trade, and against his Commercial Treaty with France. His work seemed to be that of investing with a gorgeous poetry the policy of timid content which the Whigs had inherited from Sir Robert Walpole. The very intensity of his belief in the natural development of a nation seemed to render him incapable of understanding that any good could come from particular laws or special reforms.

Nootka
Sound

It was easy to see in what way a temper such as this would be stirred by the changes which were now going on in France. The fall of the Bastille, which kindled enthusiasm in Fox, filled Burke with distrust. "Whenever a separation is made between liberty and justice," he wrote a few weeks later, "neither is safe." The night of the fourth of August, when the privileges of every class were abolished, filled him with horror. He saw, and rightly saw, in it the critical moment which revealed the character of the Revolution, and his part was taken at once. "The French," he cried in January, while Pitt was foretelling a glorious future for the new Constitution, "the French have shown themselves the ablest architects of ruin who have hitherto existed in the world. In a short space of time they have pulled to the ground their army, their navy, their commerce, their arts and their manufactures." But in Parliament he stood alone. The Whigs, though distrustfully, followed Fox in his applause of the Revolution. The Tories, yet more distrustfully, followed Pitt; and Pitt warmly expressed his sympathy with the constitutional government which was ruling France. At this moment indeed the revolutionary party gave a signal proof of its friendship for England. Irritated by an English settlement at Nootka Sound in California, Spain appealed to France for aid in accordance with the Family Compact; and the French Ministry with the constitutional party at its back resolved on a war as the best means of checking the progress of the Revolution and restoring the power of the Crown. The revolutionary party naturally opposed this design; after a bitter struggle the right of declaring war, save with the sanction of the Assembly, was taken from the King; and all danger of hostilities passed away. "The French Government,"

asserted, "was bent on cultivating the most unbounded friendship for Great Britain," and he saw no reason in its revolutionary changes why Britain should not return the friendship of France. He saw that nothing but the joint action of France and England could in the end arrest the troubles of Eastern Europe. His intervention foiled for the moment a fresh effort of Prussia to rob Poland of Dantzic and Thorn. But though Russia was still pressing her key hard, a Russian war was so unpopular in England that a simple vote in Parliament forced Pitt to discontinue his armaments; a fresh union of Austria and Prussia, which promised at this juncture to bring about a close of the Turkish struggle, promised a fresh attack on the independence of Poland.

But while Pitt was pleading for friendship between the two countries, Burke was resolved to make friendship impossible. In Parliament, as we have seen, he stood alone. He had long ceased to act, to have any hold over the House of Commons. The influence which had vied with that of Chatham during the discussions on the Stamp Act had become distasteful to the bulk of members. The length of his speeches, the profound and philosophical character of his argument, the splendour and often the extravagance of his illustrations, his passionate earnestness, his lack of temper and discretion, wearied and perplexed the squires and merchants about him. He was known at last as "the dinner of the House," so rapidly did its benches thin at his rising. At times his energies found scope in the impeachment of Hastings; the grandeur of his appeals to the justice of England hushed opposition. But with the close of the impeachment his reputation had fallen; and the approach of old age, for he was now past sixty, seemed to counsel retirement from an assembly where he felt unpopular and alone. But age and disappointment and illness were all forgotten as Burke saw rising across the Channel the embodiment of all that he hated—a Revolution founded on the ruins of the past, and threatening with ruin the whole social fabric of the past had reared; the ordered structure of classes and institutions crumbling before a doctrine of social equality; a state rudely dissolved and reconstituted; a Church and a nobility swept away in a night. Against the enthusiasm of what he rightly saw to be a political religion he resolved to rouse the enthusiasm of the House. He was at once a great orator and a great writer; and now the House was deaf to his voice, he appealed to the country through the pen. The "Reflections on the French Revolution" which appeared in October 1790, not only denounced the acts of rashness and violence which sullied the great change that France had brought about, but the very principles from which the change had sprung. Burke's deep sense of the grandeur of social order, of the continuity of that continuity in human affairs "without which men become like flies in a summer," blinded him to all but the mere rebellion and the yet sillier faith in mere novelty which obscured a real nobleness of aim and temper even in the most

1783
to
1789

Burke
and the
Revolution

1783
to
1789

ardent of the revolutionists. He would see no abuses in the past, now that it had fallen, or anything but the ruin of society in the future. He preached a crusade against men whom he regarded as the foes of religion and civilization, and called on the armies of Europe to put down a Revolution whose principles threatened every state with destruction.

Pitt and
the Revolu-
tion

The great obstacle to such a crusade was Pitt: and one of the grandest outbursts of the "Reflections" closed with a bitter taunt at the Minister. "The age of chivalry," Burke cried, "is gone; that of sophisters, economists, and calculators has succeeded, and the glory of Europe is extinguished for ever." But neither taunts nor invective moved Pitt from his course. At the moment when the "Reflections" appeared he gave a fresh assurance to France of his resolve to have nothing to do with any crusade against the Revolution. "This country," he wrote, "means to persevere in the neutrality hitherto scrupulously observed with respect to the internal dissensions of France; and from which it will never depart unless the conduct held there makes it indispensable as an act of self-defence." So far indeed was he from sharing the reactionary panic which was spreading around him that he chose this time for supporting Fox in his Libel Act, a measure which, by transferring the decision on what was libellous in any publication from the judge to the jury, completed the freedom of the press; and himself passed in 1791 a Bill which, though little noticed among the storms of the time, was one of the noblest of his achievements. He boldly put aside the dread which had been roused by the American war, that the gift of self-government to our colonies would serve only as a step towards their secession from the mother country, and established a House of Assembly and a Council in the two Canadas. "I am convinced," said Fox, who gave the measure his hearty support, "that the only method of retaining distant colonies with advantage is to enable them to govern themselves;" and the policy of the one statesman as well as the foresight of the other have been justified by the later history of our dependencies. Nor had Burke better success with his own party. Fox remained an ardent lover of the Revolution, and answered a fresh attack of Burke upon it with more than usual warmth. A close affection had bound till now the two men together; but the fanaticism of Burke declared it at an end. "There is no loss of friendship," Fox exclaimed, with a sudden burst of tears. "There is!" Burke repeated. "I know the price of my conduct. Our friendship is at an end." Within the walls of Parliament, Burke stood utterly alone. His "Appeal from the New to the Old Whigs," in June 1791, failed to detach a follower from Fox. Pitt coldly counselled him rather to praise the English Constitution than to rail at the French. "I have made many enemies and few friends," Burke wrote sadly to the French princes who had fled from their country and were gathering in arms at Coblenz, "by the part I have taken." But the opinion of the people was slowly drifting to his side. A sale of thirty thousand

1783
to
1789

es showed that the "Reflections" echoed the general sentiment of Englishmen. The mood of England indeed at this moment was unfavourable to any fair appreciation of the Revolution across the channel. Her temper was above all industrial. Men who were making hard and fast growing rich, who had the narrow and practical turn of men of business, looked angrily at its sudden disavowal of order, its restless and vague activity, its rhetorical appeals to human feeling, its abstract and often empty theories. In England it was a time of political content and social well-being, of steady economic progress, and of a powerful religious revival; the insular want of imaginative interest in other races hindered them from seeing that every element of this content, of this order, of this peaceful and harmonious progress, of this reconciliation of science and religion, was wanting abroad. The general sympathy which the Revolution had at first attracted passed slowly into distrust at the violence of its legislative changes, the anarchy of the country, the bankruptcy of its treasury, and the growing power of the mob of Paris. Sympathy in fact was soon limited to a few groups of reformers who gathered in "Constitutional Clubs," and whose reckless language only furthered the national reaction. But the site of Burke's appeals and the cries of the nobles who had fled

France and longed only to march against their country, who held back from war, and Pitt preserved his attitude of neutrality, though with a greater appearance of reserve.

anxious, in fact, did the aspect of affairs in the East make Pitt see the restoration of tranquillity in France, that he foiled a plan which his emigrant nobles had formed for a descent on the French coast, and declared formally at Vienna that England would remain absolutely neutral should hostilities arise between France and the Emperor. But the Emperor was as anxious to avoid a French war as to himself. Though Catherine, now her war with Turkey was over, wished to plunge the two German powers into a struggle with France, the Revolution which would leave her free to annex Poland single-handed, neither Leopold nor Prussia would tie their hands by such an alliance. The flight of Louis the Sixteenth from Paris in June brought Europe for a moment to the verge of war; but he was captured and brought back; and for a while the danger seemed to incline the revolutionists in France to greater moderation. They too not only accepted the Constitution, but pleaded earnestly with the Emperor against any armed intervention as certain to bring ruin to his throne. In their conference at Pillnitz therefore, in August, Leopold and the King of Prussia contented themselves with a vague declaration inviting the European powers to co-operate in restoring a sound form of government in France, availed themselves of England's neutrality to refuse all military aid to the royal princes, and dealt simply with the affairs of Poland. But peace they desired soon became impossible. The Constitutionalists in France availed themselves of the irritation caused by the declaration of Pillnitz to rouse again the cry for a war which,

Conference of
Pillnitz

1783
to
1789

as they hoped, would give strength to the throne. The Jacobins, on the other hand, under the influence of the "Girondists," or deputies from the south of France, whose aim was a republic, and who saw in a great national struggle a means of overthrowing the monarchy, decided in spite of the opposition of Robespierre on a contest with the Emperor. Both parties united to demand the breaking up of an army which the emigrant princes had formed on the Rhine; and though Leopold assented to this demand, France declared war against his successor, Francis, in April 1792.

Pitt's
struggle
or
peace

Misled by their belief in a revolutionary enthusiasm in England, the French Constitutionals had hoped for her alliance in this war; but though Pitt at once refused aid and stipulated that Holland must remain untouched, he promised neutrality even though Belgium should for a time be occupied by a French army. In the same temper he announced in 1792 a reduction of military forces, and brought forward a Peace Budget which rested on a large remission of taxation. But peace grew hourly more impossible. The French revolutionists, in their eagerness to find an ally in their war, were striving by intrigues with the Constitutional Clubs to rouse the spirit in England which they had roused in France. The French ambassador, Chauvelin, boldly protested against a proclamation which denounced this seditious correspondence. Even Fox, at such a moment, declared that the discussion of Parliamentary reform was inexpedient. Meanwhile Burke was working hard, in writings whose extravagance of style was forgotten in their intensity of feeling, to spread alarm throughout Europe. He had from the first encouraged the emigrant princes to take arms, and sent his son to join them at Coblenz. "Be alarmists," he wrote to them; "diffuse terror!" But the royalist terror which he sowed had at last roused a revolutionary terror in France itself. At the threat of war against the Emperor the two German Courts had drawn together, and reluctantly abandoning all hope of peace with France, gathered eighty thousand men under the Duke of Brunswick, and advanced slowly in August on the Meuse. France, though she had forced on the struggle, was really almost defenceless; her army in Belgium broke at the first shock of arms into shameful rout; and the panic, spreading from the army to the nation at large, took violent and horrible forms. At the first news of Brunswick's advance the mob of Paris broke into the Tuileries on the 10th of August; and on its demand Lewis, who had taken refuge in the Assembly, was suspended from his office and imprisoned in the Temple. From this moment the Revolution, if by the Revolution we mean the progress of France towards political, social, and religious freedom, was at an end. The populace of Paris, with the Commune of Paris at its head, imposed its will upon the Assembly and upon the nation. The only changes which France was for a long time to experience were changes of masters; but whether the Commune or the Directory or Buonaparte were its despot, the government was a simple despotism. And despotism, as ever,

its work with bloodshed and terror. While General Dumouriez by boldness and adroit negotiations arrested the progress of the allies in the defiles of the Argonne, bodies of paid mercenaries butchered in September the royalist prisoners who held the gaols of Paris, with a view of influencing the elections of the new Convention which met to proclaim the abolition of royalty. The retreat of Brunswick's army, whose numbers had been reduced by disease till an advance on Paris became impossible, and a brilliant victory won by Dumouriez at Jemappes which laid the Netherlands at his feet, turned the panic of the French into a wild confidence. In November the Convention decreed that France should demand the aid of her soldiers to all nations who would strive for liberty. "All Governments are our enemies," said its President; "all peoples are our allies." In the teeth of treaties signed only a few years before, and without any pretext for war, the French government resolved to attack Holland, and ordered its generals to force by arms the opening of the Scheldt.

To do this was to force England into war. Public opinion was passing a harder day by day upon Pitt. The horror of the massacres of September, the hideous despotism of the Parisian mob, had made more to estrange England from the Revolution than all the eloquence of Burke. But even while withdrawing our Minister from London on the imprisonment of the King, Pitt clung stubbornly to the hope of peace. He had hindered Holland from joining the coalition against France. His hope was to bring the war to an end through English mediation, and to "leave France, which I believe to be the best way, to arrange its own internal affairs as it can." No doubt Pitt's life is so great as the hour when he stood alone in London, and refused to bow to the growing cry of the nation for war. Even the news of the September massacres could only force upon him a hope that France might abstain from any war of conquest and escape from its social anarchy. In October the British agent in England reported that Pitt was about to recognize the new republic. At the opening of November he still pressed on England a steady neutrality. It was France, and not England, that at last wrenched from his grasp the peace to which he clung desperately. The decree of the Convention and the attack on the Dutch left him no choice but war, for it was impossible for England to endure a French fleet at Antwerp, or to desert allies like the United Provinces. But even in December the news of the wretched partition of Poland nerved him to a last struggle for peace; he offered to aid Austria in acquiring Bavaria if she would make terms with France, and pledged himself to France to abstain from war if that power would cease from violating the independence of her neighbour states. But across the Channel his moderation was only taken for fear, while in England the general mourning that followed on the news of the French King's execution showed a growing ardour for the inevitable contest. Both sides now shut themselves from diplomatic communications, and in February 1793 England issued her Declaration of War.

1783
to
1789

France
declares
War on
England

1793
to
1815

SECTION IV.—THE WAR WITH FRANCE, 1793—1815

[*Authorities.*—To those already mentioned there may be added the biographies of Castlereagh, Eldon, and Sidmouth; the "Memoirs" of Romilly; the Cornwallis Correspondence, and other similar works. For the general history of England, see Lecky, "History of Ireland"; Massey, "History of England during the Reign of George III."; and May, "Constitutional History." Fortescue, "British Statesmen of the Great War," is very illuminating, and Toynbee, "Industrial Revolution," is a brilliant study of that event. For the Peninsular War, see Napier's "History," and the more recent history by Oman. For contemporary foreign history, Sorel, "L'Europe et la Révolution Française," and Rose, "Napoleon I." Complete bibliographies will be found in the "Cambridge Modern History."]

France
and the
Coalition

From the moment when France declared war against England Pitt's power was at an end. His pride, his immovable firmness, and the general confidence of the nation still kept him at the head of affairs; but from this moment he drifted along with a tide of popular feeling which he never fully understood. The very excellences of his character unfitted him for the conduct of a war. He was in fact a Peace Minister, forced into war by a panic and enthusiasm which he shared in a very small degree, and unaided by his father's gift of at once entering into the sympathies and passions around him, or of rousing passions and sympathies in return. Politically indeed his task at home became an easy one, for the nation was united by its longing to fight. Even the bulk of the Whigs, with the Duke of Portland, Lords Fitzwilliam and Spencer, and Mr. Wyndham at their head, deserted Fox when he remained firm in his love of France and of the Revolution, and gave their support to the ministry. Abroad all seemed at first to go ill for France. She was girt in by a ring of enemies: the Emperor, Prussia, Saxony, Sardinia, and Spain were leagued in arms against her, and their efforts were seconded by civil war. The peasants of Poitou and Brittany rose in revolt against the Revolutionary government. Marseilles and Lyons were driven into insurrection by the Jacobins, as the more violent leaders who had now seized the supreme power were called, and a great naval port, that of Toulon, not only hoisted the royalist flag, but admitted an English garrison within its walls. The French armies had already been driven back from Belgium and across the Rhine, when ten thousand English soldiers, under the Duke of York, joined the Austrians in Flanders in 1793. But the chance of crushing the Revolution was lost by the greed and incapacity of the allied powers. Russia, as Pitt had foreseen, was now free to carry out her schemes in the East; and Austria and Prussia turned from the vigorous prosecution of the French war to new attacks upon Poland. The allies frittered away in sieges the force which was ready for an advance into the heart of France until the revolt of the West and South was alike drowned in blood. Whatever were the crimes and violence

the Jacobin leaders at this critical moment, France felt in spite of the value of the Revolution, and rallied enthusiastically to its support. In 1794 the English were driven from Toulon by a young artillery officer from Corsica, whose name was to become famous, Napoleon Buonaparte; while a victory at Fleurus again made the French masters of the Netherlands. At this moment, too, the overthrow and death of their leader, Maximilian Robespierre, brought about the downfall of the Jacobins, and a more moderate government which succeeded, the government of the Directory, led the whole people in the defence of the country. Victory everywhere followed on the gigantic efforts with which France met the coalition against it. Spain was forced to sue for peace, the Austrians were driven over the Alps, the provinces along the Rhine were wrested from the Austrians, and the starving and untrained soldiers of the Republic threw back the English army from Walcheren and the Meuse and entered Amsterdam in triumph.

The victories of France broke up the confederacy which had threatened it with destruction. Spain, Sweden, and Prussia hastened to make peace with the French Republic. Pitt himself became the best friend for peace. He was indeed without means of efficiently waging on the war. The English army was small and without military experience, while its leaders were utterly incapable. "We have no General," wrote Lord Grenville, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, "but some old woman in a red riband." Nor was weakness of Pitt's only ground for desiring the close of the war. Flexible and impassive as he seemed, he felt bitterly that the war was undoing all that he had done. The growth of the public debt was terrible. If England was without soldiers, she had no money, and Pitt was forced to turn her wealth into an engine of war.

He became the paymaster of the Coalition, and his subsidies brought the allied armies into the field. Immense loans were raised for his purpose and for a war expenditure at home which was as excessive as it was extravagant. The public debt rose by leaps and bounds. Taxation, which had reached its lowest point under Pitt's administration, mounted to a height undreamed of before. The public suffering was increased by a general panic. Burke had not only too successful in his resolve to "diffuse the terror." The enthusiasts of France and of republicanism in England were in reality a few handfuls of men, who played at gathering conventions and at calling themselves citizens and patriots in childish imitation of what was going on across the Channel. But the dread of Revolution passed beyond the bounds of reason. Even Pitt, though utterly untouched by the political reaction around him, was shaken by the dream of social danger, and believed in the existence of "thousands of bandits," who were ready to rise against the government, to murder every landlord, and to sack London. "Paine is a fool," he said to his niece, who quoted to him the "Rights of Man," in which that author had vindicated the principles of the Revolution; "he is perhaps right; but if I did what he wants,

1793
to
1815

The
English
Terror

1793
to
1815

I should have thousands of bandits on my hands to-morrow, and London burnt." He shared the belief in a social danger with Parliament and with the nation at large. The Habeas Corpus Act was suspended, a bill against seditious assemblies restricted the liberty of public meeting, and a wider scope was given to the Statute of Treasons. Prosecution after prosecution was directed against the Press; the sermons of some dissenting ministers were indicted as seditious; and the conventions of sympathizers with France were roughly broken up. The worst excesses of the panic were witnessed in Scotland, where young Whigs, whose only offence was an advocacy of Parliamentary reform, were sentenced to transportation, and where a brutal judge openly expressed his regret that the practice of torture in seditious cases should have fallen into disuse. In England, however, the social panic soon passed away as suddenly as it had come. In 1794 three leaders of the Corresponding Society, a body which professed sympathy with France, Hardy, Thelwall, and Horne Tooke, were brought to trial on a charge of high treason, but their acquittal proved that the terror was over. Save for occasional riots, to which the poor were goaded by sheer want of bread, no social disturbance appeared in England through the twenty years of the war.

Progress
of the
War

But though failure abroad and panic and suffering at home made Pitt earnest to close the struggle with the Revolution, he stood almost alone in his longings for peace. The nation at large was still ardent for war, and its ardour was fired by Burke in his "Letters on a Regicide Peace," which denounced Pitt's attempt in 1796 to negotiate with France. Nor was France less ardent for war than England. Prussia had become a friend, and Spain an ally, in 1795. Her victories had roused hopes of wider conquests, and though General Moreau was foiled in a march on Vienna, the wonderful successes of Napoleon Buonaparte, who now took the command of the army of the Alps, laid Piedmont at her feet. The year 1797 saw Lombardy conquered in a single campaign; and Austria was forced to purchase peace in the treaty of Campo Formio by the cession of the Netherlands and Milanese to the French Republic. England was left without a single ally. Her credit had sunk to the lowest ebb, and the alarm of a French invasion brought about a suspension of cash payments on the part of the Bank, while a mutiny of the fleet which continued for three months was ended by humiliating concessions. It was in this darkest hour of the struggle that Burke passed away, protesting to the last against the peace which, in spite of his previous failure, Pitt tried in 1797 to negotiate at Lille. But the Minister's efforts were again foiled by the unquenched hatred of the two nations. A French threat of invasion put an end to the depression and disunion which had grown up in England. Credit revived, and in spite of the enormous taxation a public subscription poured two millions into the Treasury towards the expenses of the war. Great military and naval triumphs restored the confidence of the nation. In rejecting

as offers of peace the Directory had counted on a rising which looked for in Ireland, and on a war in India where Tippoo, the successor of Hyder Ali in Mysore, had vowed to drive English from the south. But in 1798 the Irish rising was ended in a defeat of the insurgents at Vinegar Hill; and Tippoo's death in the storm of his own capital, Seringapatam, only saved him from witnessing the English conquest of Mysore. A yet further success awaited the British flag at sea. Throughout the war England had maintained her naval supremacy, and the triumphs of her seamen were in strange contrast with her weakness on land. In the outset of the contest the French fleet was defeated and destroyed by Lord Howe in a victory which bore the name of the day which it was won, June the 1st, 1794. When Spain joined the alliance, her fleet was attacked in 1797 by Admiral Jervis off Cape Vincent, and driven with terrible loss back to Cadiz. When France was conquered by France, her navy was used by the conquerors to attack the English in the Channel with a view to a landing on Ireland. But the Dutch fleet from the Texel was met by the British fleet under Admiral Duncan, and almost annihilated in a battle of Camperdown in 1797, an obstinate struggle which showed the Hollanders still worthy of their old renown. The next year saw the crowning victory of the Nile. After his successes in Italy and Egypt Napoleon Buonaparte had conceived the design of a conquest of Egypt and Syria, a march upon Constantinople, and the subjection of the Turkish Empire. Only the first step in this vast project was to be realized. He landed in Egypt, and by a defeat of the Mamelukes soon reduced that country to submission. But the thirteen men-of-war which had escorted his expedition were found by Admiral Nelson in Aboukir Bay, moored close to the shore in a line, guarded at either end by gun-boats and batteries. Nelson moved to thrust his own ships between the French and the shore; his flagship led the way; and after a terrible fight of twelve hours, eleven of the French vessels were captured and destroyed, two were blown up, and five thousand French seamen were killed or made prisoners.

The battle of the Nile and the failure of Buonaparte in an invasion of Syria aided Pitt to revive the coalition of the continental powers against France. A union of the Russian and Prussian armies drove the French back again across the Alps and the Rhine. Italy and the Rhineland were lost, and only the neutrality of General Massena held Switzerland for the Republic. The part which England took in this struggle was an invasion of Egypt by a force under the Duke of York, which ended in a miserable failure; but an English captain, Sir Sidney Smith, foiled Buonaparte's projects on Syria by his defence of Acre, and the British General, despairing of further success, abandoned his army, which surrendered at a later time to a British expedition, and returned to Europe. The confidence of Pitt in the success of the coalition for the first time blinded him to the opening for peace

England
alone in
the War

1793
to
1815

that offered itself in the new position of French affairs which was brought about by Buonaparte's return, by his overthrow of the Directory, and his elevation to the office of First Consul of the Republic. His offers of peace were no doubt intended simply to dissolve the Coalition, and gain breathing time for a new organization of France and a new attack on Europe; but their rejection by England was intemperate and unwise. The military genius of the First Consul, however, soon reversed the hopes of the Allies. In 1800 he crossed the St. Bernard, and by his victory at Marengo forced Austria to conclude a peace at Luneville which fixed the frontiers of France at the Rhine, and established a Cisalpine Republic, entirely dependent on her, in Lombardy. At the same time the surrender to England of the island of Malta, which had been taken from the Knights of St. John by a French fleet, and had ever since been blockaded by English ships, stirred the resentment of the Czar Paul, who looked on himself as the patron of the Knights; and at his instigation Sweden and Denmark joined Russia in a league of armed neutrality, and protested against the right of search by which England prevented the importation to France in neutral vessels of materials which might be used in war.

Ireland
under
the
Georges

But it was at this moment, when England stood once more alone, that Pitt won the greatest of his political triumphs in the union of Ireland with England. The history of Ireland, from its conquest by William the Third up to this time, is one which no Englishman can recall without shame. Since the surrender of Limerick every Catholic Irishman, and there were five Catholics to every Protestant, had been treated as a stranger and a foreigner in his own country. The House of Lords, the House of Commons, the right of voting for representatives in Parliament, the magistracy, all corporate offices in towns, all ranks in the army, the bench, the bar, the whole administration of government or justice, were closed against Catholics. Few Catholic landowners had been left by the sweeping confiscations which had followed the successive revolts of the island, and oppressive laws forced even these few with scant exceptions to profess Protestantism. Necessity, indeed, had brought about a practical toleration of their religion and their worship; but in all social and political matters the native Catholics, in other words the immense majority of the people of Ireland, were simply hewers of wood and drawers of water to their Protestant masters, who still looked on themselves as mere settlers, who boasted of their Scotch or English extraction, and who regarded the name of "Irishman" as an insult. But small as was this Protestant body, one half of it fared little better, as far as power was concerned, than the Catholics; for the Presbyterians, who formed the bulk of the Ulster settlers, were shut out by law from all civil, military, and municipal offices. The administration and justice of the country were thus kept rigidly in the hands of members of the Established Church, a body which comprised about a twelfth of the population of the island; while its government was

ically monopolised by a few great Protestant landowners. rotten boroughs, which had originally been created to make Irish Parliament dependent on the Crown, had by this time under the influence of the adjacent landlords; whose control of these made them masters of the House of Commons, while formed in person the House of Peers. To such a length had the system been carried that at the time of the Union more than 100 seats were in the hands of three families alone,—that of Lord Ashurst, of the Ponsonbys, and of the Beresfords. One half of the House of Commons, in fact, was returned by a small group of men, who were recognized as “parliamentary undertakers,” and undertook to “manage” Parliament on their own terms. Politics were for these men a mere means of public plunder; they were glutted with pensions, preferments, and bribes in hard return for their services; they were the advisers of every Lieutenant, and the practical governors of the country. The result was what might have been expected; and for more than a century Ireland was the worst governed country in Europe. That the Government was not even worse than it was, was due to its connection with England and the subordination of its Parliament to the English Privy Council. The Irish Parliament had no power of initiating legislative or financial measures, and could only say “yes” or “no” to Acts submitted to it by the Privy Council in London. The English Parliament, too, claimed the right of binding Ireland as well as England by its enactments, and one of its first acts transferred the appellate jurisdiction of the Irish Peerage to the English House of Lords. Galling as these restrictions were to the plundering aristocracy of Ireland, they formed a useful check on its tyranny. But as if to compensate for the benefits of protection, England did her best to annihilate Irish commerce and to ruin Irish agriculture. Statutes passed by the jealousy of English landowners forbade the export of Irish cattle or sheep to English ports. The export of wool was forbidden, lest it might interfere with the profits of English wool-growers. Poverty was added to the curse of misgovernment, and poverty deepened the rapid growth of the native population, till famine turned the country into a hell.

The bitter lesson of the last conquest, however, long sufficed to check all dreams of revolt among the natives, and the murders and riots which sprang from time to time out of the general misery and discontent were roughly repressed by the ruling class. When it threatened at last, the threat came from the ruling class. Some timid efforts made by the English Government at the accession of George the Third to control its tyranny were answered by a refusal of money bills, and by a cry for the removal of the restrictions imposed on the independence of the Irish Parliament. But it was not till the American war that this cry became a political power. The threat of a French invasion and the want of any regular force to oppose it compelled the Government to call on Ireland to

1793
to
1815

Pitt and
Ireland

1793
to
1815

provide for its own defence, and forty thousand volunteers appeared in arms in 1779. The force was wholly a Protestant one, commanded by Protestant officers, and it was turned to account by the Protestant aristocracy. Threats of an armed revolt backed the eloquence of two Parliamentary leaders, Grattan and Flood, in their demand of "Irish independence;" and the Volunteers bid for the sympathy of the native Catholics, who looked with indifference on these quarrels of their masters, by claiming for them a relaxation of the penal laws against the exercise of their religion and of some of their most oppressive disabilities. So real was the danger that England was forced to give way; and Lord Rockingham induced the British Parliament to abandon in 1782 the judicial and legislative supremacy it had till then asserted over that of Ireland. From this moment England and Ireland were simply held together by the fact that the sovereign of the one island was also the sovereign of the other. During the next eighteen years Ireland was "independent;" but its independence was a mere name for the uncontrolled rule of a few noble families. The victory of the Volunteers had been won simply to the profit of the "undertakers," who returned the majority of members in the Irish House of Commons, and themselves formed the Irish House of Lords. The suspension of any control or interference from England left Ireland at these men's mercy, and they soon showed that they meant to keep it for themselves. When the Catholics claimed admission to the franchise or to equal civil rights as a reward for their aid in the late struggle, their claim was rejected. A similar demand of the Presbyterians, who had formed a good half of the Volunteers, for the removal of their disabilities was equally set aside. Even Grattan, when he pleaded for a reform which would make the Parliament at least a fair representative of the Protestant Englishry, utterly failed. The ruling class found government too profitable to share it with other possessors. It was only by hard bribery that the English Government could secure their co-operation in the simplest measures of administration. "If ever there was a country unfit to govern itself," said Lord Hutchinson, "it is Ireland. A corrupt aristocracy, a ferocious commonalty, a distracted Government, a divided people!" The real character of this Parliamentary rule was seen in the rejection of Pitt's offer of free trade. In Pitt's eyes the danger of Ireland lay not so much in its factious aristocracy as in the misery of the people they governed. Although the Irish Catholics were held down by the brute force of their Protestant rulers, he saw that their discontent was growing fast into rebellion, and that one secret of their discontent at any rate lay in Irish poverty, a poverty increased if not originally brought about by the jealous exclusion of Irish products from their natural markets in England itself. One of his first commercial measures put an end to this exclusion by a bill which established freedom of trade between the two islands. But though he met successfully the fears and jealousies of the English farmers and manufacturers, he was

l by the factious ignorance of the Irish landowners, and his was rejected by the Irish Parliament. So utterly was he disgusted that only the outbreak of the Revolutionary struggle, the efforts which France at once made to excite rebellion against the Irish Catholics, roused him to fresh measures of concision and good government. In 1792 he forced on the Irish important measures for the admission of Catholics to the electoral franchise, and to civil and military offices within the island, which seemed to open a new era of religious liberty. But the promise was too late. The hope of conciliation was lost in the fast rising of religious and social passion. An association of "United men," begun among the Protestants of Ulster with a view to obtaining Parliamentary reform, drifted into a correspondence with France and projects of insurrection. The Catholic peasantry, suffering over their misery and their wrongs, were equally stirred by news from France; and their discontent broke out in the names of "Defenders" and "Peep-o'-day Boys," who held the country in terror. For a while, however, the Protestant landowners, joined together in "Orange Societies," held the country down by terror and bloodshed.

At last the smouldering discontent and disaffection burst into flame. Ireland was in fact driven into rebellion by the lawlessness of the Orange yeomanry and the English troops. In 1796 and 1797 soldiers and yeomanry marched over the country torturing and scourging the "croppies," as the Irish insurgents were called in derision from their short-cut hair, robbing, ravishing, and murdering. Their outrages were sanctioned by a Bill of Indemnity passed by the Irish Parliament; and protected for the future by an Insurrection Act and a suspension of the Habeas Corpus. Meanwhile the United Irishmen prepared for an insurrection, which was frustrated by the failure of the French expeditions on which they counted for support, and above all by the victory of Camperdown. Atrocities were answered by atrocities when the revolt at last broke out in 1798. Loyal Protestants were lashed and tortured in their homes, and every soldier taken was butchered without mercy. There was however no sooner mustered fifteen thousand men strong camp on Vinegar Hill near Enniscorthy than the camp was surrounded by the English troops, and the revolt utterly suppressed. The suppression only just came in time to prevent greater disasters. A few weeks after the close of the rebellion a thousand French soldiers under General Humbert landed in Mayo, broke a force of 1,000 of their number in a battle at Castlebar, and only surrendered to the Lord-Lieutenant, Lord Cornwallis, faced them with thirty thousand men. Lord Cornwallis, a wise and humane ruler, found great difficulty in checking the reprisals of his troops and of the vengeance than in stamping out the last embers of insurrection; the hideous cruelty brought about one good result. Pitt's first act at "the bigoted fury of Irish Protestants" ended in a firm resolve to put an end to the farce of "Independence," which left

1793
to
1815

The
Union

Ireland helpless in their hands. The political necessity for a union of the two islands had already been brought home to every English statesman by the course of the Irish Parliament during the disputes over the Regency; for, while England repelled the claims of the Prince of Wales to the Regency as of right, Ireland admitted them. As the only union left between the two peoples was their obedience to a common ruler, such an act might conceivably have ended in their entire severance; and the sense of this danger secured a welcome on this side of the Channel for Pitt's proposal to unite the two Parliaments. The opposition of the Irish boroughmongers was naturally stubborn and determined. But with them it was a sheer question of gold; and the assent of the Irish Parliament was bought with a million in money, and with a liberal distribution of pensions and peerages to its members. Base and shameless as such means were, Pitt may fairly plead that they were the only means by which the bill for the Union could have been passed. As the matter was finally arranged in June 1800, one hundred Irish members became part of the House of Commons at Westminster, and twenty-eight temporal with four spiritual peers, chosen for each Parliament by their fellows, took their seats in the House of Lords. Commerce between the two countries was freed from all restrictions, and all the trading privileges of the one were thrown open to the other; while taxation was proportionately distributed between the two peoples.

Pitt
and the
Peerage

The lavish creation of peers which formed a part of the price paid for the Union of Ireland was only an instance of Pitt's deliberate policy in dealing with the peerage. If he had failed to reform the House of Commons, he was able to bring about a practical change in our constitution by his reform of the House of Lords. Few bodies have varied more in the number of their members. At the close of the Wars of the Roses the lay lords who remained numbered fifty-two; in Elizabeth's reign they numbered only sixty; the prodigal creations of the Stuarts raised them to one hundred and sixty-eight. At this point, however, they practically remained stationary during the reigns of the first two Georges; and, as we have seen, only the dogged opposition of Walpole prevented Lord Stanhope from limiting the peerage to the number it had at that time reached. Mischievous as such a measure would have been, it would at any rate have prevented the lavish creation of peerages on which George the Third relied in the early days of his reign as one of his means of breaking up the party government which restrained him. But what was with the King a mere means of corruption became with Pitt a settled purpose of transferring the peerage from a narrow and exclusive caste into a large representation of the wealth of England. As he defined his aim, it was to use the House of Lords as a means of rewarding merit, to bring the peerage into closer relations with the landowning and opulent classes, and to render the Crown independent of factious combinations among the existing peers. While himself therefore dis-

of hereditary honours, he lavished them as no Minister had ever done before. In his first five years of rule he created fifty peers. In two later years alone, 1796-7, he created thirty-five. 301 the peerages which were the price of the Union with Ireland had helped to raise his creations to one hundred and forty. So busily was his example followed by his successors that at the end of George the Third's reign the number of hereditary peers had become double what it was at his accession. Nor was the change in the peerage merely one of numbers. The whole character of the House of Lords was changed. Up to this time it had been a mere assembly of great nobles, bound together by family or party into a distinct power in the State. By pouring into it members of the middle and commercial class, who formed the basis of his social power, small landowners, bankers, merchants, nabobs, contractors, lawyers, soldiers and seamen, Pitt revolutionized the Upper House. It became the stronghold, not of blood, but of property, the representative of the great estates and great fortunes. At the same time the vast increase of English wealth was building up, for the first time, too, in our history it became the distinctly conservative element in our constitution. The full import of Pitt's changes has still to be revealed, but in some ways their results have been very different from the end at which he aimed. The number of the peerage, though due to the will of the Crown, has practically freed the House from any influence which the Crown might exert by the distribution of honours. This change, since the power of the Crown has been practically wielded by the House of Commons, has rendered it far harder to reconcile the free action of the Lords with the regular working of constitutional government. On the other hand, the larger number of its members has rendered the House more responsive to public opinion, when public opinion was strongly pronounced: and the political tact which is inherent in aristocratic assemblies has hitherto prevented any collision between the Lower House from being pushed to an irreconcilable result. Perhaps the most direct result of the change is seen in the undoubted popularity of the House of Lords with the mass of the people. The large number of its members, and the constant accessions to them from almost every class of the community, has freed it as yet from the suspicion and ill will which in almost every other constitutional country has hampered the effective working of a second legislative chamber.

At the legislative union of the two countries was only part of a great plan which Pitt had conceived for the conciliation of Ireland. With the conclusion of the Union his projects of free trade between the two countries, which had been defeated a few years before by the folly of the Irish Parliament, came quietly into play; in spite of insufficient capital and social disturbance, the growth of the trade, shipping, and manufactures of Ireland has gone on without a check from that time to this. The change which brought Ireland directly under the common Parliament was followed too

1793
to
1815

Catholic
Emancipation

1793
to
1815

by a gradual revision of its oppressive laws and an amendment in their administration; taxation was lightened, and a faint beginning made of public instruction. But in Pitt's mind the great means of conciliation was the concession of religious equality. In proposing to the English Parliament the union of the two countries he had pointed out that, when thus joined to a Protestant country like England, all danger of a Catholic supremacy in Ireland, should Catholic disabilities be removed, would be practically at an end; and had suggested that in such a case "an effectual and adequate provision for the Catholic clergy" would be a security for their loyalty. His words gave strength to the hopes of "Catholic Emancipation," or the removal of the civil disabilities of Catholics, which were held out by Lord Castlereagh in Ireland itself as means of hindering any opposition to the project of Union on the part of the Catholics. It was agreed on all sides that their opposition would have secured its defeat; but no Catholic opposition showed itself. After the passing of the bill, Pitt prepared to lay before the Cabinet a measure which would have raised not only the Catholic but the Dissenter to perfect equality of civil rights. He proposed to remove all religious tests which limited the exercise of the franchise, or were required for admission to Parliament, the magistracy, the bar, municipal offices, or posts in the army or the service of the State. Political security was provided for by the imposition, in the place of the Sacramental Test, of an oath of allegiance and of fidelity to the Constitution; while the loyalty of the Catholic and Dissenting clergy was secured by the grant of some provision to both by the State. To conciliate the Church, measures were added for strengthening its means of discipline, and for increasing the stipends of its poorer ministers. A commutation of tithes was to remove a constant source of quarrel in Ireland between the episcopal clergy and the people. The scheme was too large and statesmanlike to secure the immediate assent of the Cabinet, and before that assent could be won the plan was communicated through the treachery of the Chancellor, Lord Loughborough, to George the Third. "I count any man my personal enemy," the King broke out angrily to Dundas, "who proposes any such measure." Pitt answered this outburst by submitting his whole plan to the King. "The political circumstances under which the exclusive laws originated," he wrote, "arising either from the conflicting power of hostile and nearly balanced sects, from the apprehension of a Popish Queen as successor, a disputed succession and a foreign pretender, a division in Europe between Catholic and Protestant Powers, are no longer applicable to the present state of things." But argument was wasted upon George the Third. In spite of the decision of the lawyers whom he consulted, the King held himself bound by his Coronation Oath to maintain the tests; and his bigotry agreed too well with the religious hatred and political distrust of the Catholics which still prevailed among the bulk of the English people not to

his decision fatal to the bill. Pitt however held firm to its principle; he resigned in February 1801, and was succeeded by the leader of the House of Commons, Mr. Addington, a man as dull and bigoted as George himself.

1793
to
1815

Hardly a single member of the Addington Ministry could be reckoned as rising even to the second rank of political eminence, their work was mainly one of peace. Although the debt had risen from 244 millions to 520, the desire for peace sprang from no sense of national exhaustion. On the contrary, wealth had never increased so fast. Steam and canals, with the inventions of Arkwright and Crompton, were producing their effect in a rapid development of trade and manufactures, and commerce found fresh fields in the colonies gained by the war; for the union of Holland and the French Republic had been followed by the seizure of the Cape of Good Hope, of Ceylon, of Malacca, and of the Dutch possessions in the Spice Islands. Nor was there any ground for complacency in the aspect of the war itself. The Treaty of Luneville, as we have seen, left England alone in the struggle against France; while an armed neutrality of the Northern powers, with Czar Paul of Russia at its head, revived the claim that a neutral flag should cover even contraband of war. But in 1800 the surrender of Malta to the English fleet gave it the mastery of the Mediterranean; and General Abercromby, landing with a small force in Aboukir Bay, defeated on the 21st of March, 1801, the French army that Buonaparte had left in Egypt, and which soon found itself forced to surrender in the Convention of Cairo. By the evacuation of Egypt, India was secured and Turkey saved from falling into a dependency of France. In April a British fleet appeared before Copenhagen, and after a desperate struggle silenced the Danish batteries, captured the bulk of the Danish ships, and forced Denmark to withdraw from the Northern Coalition, which was finally broken up by the death of the Czar. Both parties in this gigantic struggle however were at last anxious for peace. On the English side there was a general sense that the struggle with Revolutionary France was in fact at an end. Not only had England held its principles at bay, but the war had at last seated on the throne of France a military despot who hated the principles of the Revolution even more than England did. So far as France herself was concerned, the First Consul, Buonaparte, was eager at the moment for peace which would enable him to establish his power and to crush the last sparks of freedom in the country of which he had made himself in reality the absolute master.

The
Addington
Ministry

After long negotiations the Peace of Amiens was concluded in March, 1802, on terms of mutual restitution. France promised to evacuate the Ionian Islands, and to leave the new republics it had established in the countries along its border to themselves. England agreed to give up her newly conquered colonies save Ceylon, and to place the Knights of St. John in the isle of Malta. "It is a peace which everybody is glad of and nobody is proud of," said a

Peace of
Amiens

1793
to
1815

witty critic; but there was a general sense of relief at the close of the long struggle, and the new French ambassador was drawn in triumph on his arrival through the streets of London. But the Peace brought no rest to Buonaparte's ambition. It was soon plain that England would have to bear the brunt of a new contest, but of a contest wholly different in kind from that which the Peace had put an end to. Whatever had been the errors of the French Revolutionists, even their worst attacks on the independence of the nations around them had been veiled by a vague notion of freeing the peoples whom they invaded from the yoke of their rulers. But the aim of Buonaparte was simply that of a vulgar conqueror. He was resolute to be master of the western world, and no notions of popular freedom or sense of national right ever interfered with his resolve. The means at his command were immense. The political life of the Revolution had been cut short by his military despotism, but the new social vigour it had given to France through the abolition of privileges and the creation of a new middle class on the ruins of the clergy and the nobles still lived on. While the dissensions which tore France asunder were hushed by the policy of the First Consul, by his restoration of the Church as a religious power, his recall of the exiles, and the economy and wise administration which distinguished his rule, the centralized system of government bequeathed by the Monarchy to the Revolution and by the Revolution to Buonaparte enabled him easily to seize this national vigour for the profit of his own despotism. The exhaustion of the brilliant hopes raised by the Revolution, the craving for public order, the military enthusiasm and the impulse of a new glory given by the wonderful victories France had won, made a Tyranny possible; and in the hands of Buonaparte this tyranny was supported by a secret police, by the suppression of the press and of all freedom of opinion, and above all by the iron will and immense ability of the First Consul himself. Once chosen Consul for life, he felt himself secure at home, and turned restlessly to the work of outer aggression. The republics established on the borders of France were brought into mere dependence on his will. Piedmont and Parma were annexed to France; and a French army occupied Switzerland. The temperate protests of the English Government were answered by demands for the expulsion of the French exiles who had been living in England ever since the Revolution, and for its surrender of Malta, which was retained till some security could be devised against a fresh seizure of the island by the French fleet. It was plain that a struggle was inevitable; and in May 1803 the armaments preparing in the French ports hastened the formal declaration of war.

Trafal-
gar

Whatever differences might have parted Whig from Tory in the earlier war with the Revolution, all were at one in the war against the ambition of Buonaparte. England was now the one country where freedom in any sense remained alive. "Every other monument of European liberty has perished," cried Sir James Mackintosh,

of the most eminent of the Whig leaders. "That ancient fabric had been gradually raised by the wisdom and virtue of our fathers still stands; but it stands alone, and it stands among !" With the fall of England despotism would have been universal throughout Europe; and it was at England that Buonaparte resolved to strike the first blow in his career of conquest. "Twenty millions of people," he said, in allusion to the disproportion between the population of England and France, "must way to forty millions." His attempt to strike at the English in India through the Mahrattas of the central provinces was foiled by their defeat at Assaye; but an invasion of England itself was planned on a gigantic scale. A camp of one hundred thousand was formed at Boulogne, and a host of flat-bottomed boats was ordered for their conveyance across the Channel. The peril of the nation not only united all political parties but recalled Pitt to power. On the retirement of Addington in 1804, Pitt proposed to do Fox and the leading Whigs in his new Ministry, but he was rebuffed by the bigotry of the King; and the refusal of Lord Grenville and Wyndham to take office without Fox, as well as the loss of support at a later time by his ablest supporter, Dundas, left Pitt isolated alone. His health was broken and his appearance was faded and depressed; but he faced difficulty and danger with the same courage as of old. The invasion seemed imminent when Napoleon, who had now assumed the title of Emperor, appeared in camp at Boulogne. "Let us be masters of the Channel for six months," he is reported to have said, "and we are masters of the world." A skilfully combined plan by which the British fleet would have been divided, while the whole French navy was concentrated in the Channel, was delayed by the death of the admiral destined to execute it. But an alliance with Spain placed the Spanish fleet at Napoleon's disposal in 1805, and he formed a fresh scheme for a union with that of France, the crushing of the squadron under Admiral Jervis which blocked the ports of the Channel before Admiral Nelson could come to its support, and a crossing of the vast armament thus protected to the English shore. Three hundred thousand soldiers mustered in England to meet the coming attack; but Napoleon trusted more to a new league which he had succeeded in forming with the Continent itself. The annexation of Genoa by Napoleon aided him in his effort; and Russia, Austria, and Sweden joined in alliance to wrest Italy and the Low Countries from the grasp of the French Emperor. Napoleon meanwhile swept the sea in vain in the vain glimpse of the great armament whose assembly in the Channel he had so skilfully planned. Admiral Villeneuve, uniting the Spanish ships at Cadiz with his own squadron from Toulon, drew off in pursuit to the West Indies and then suddenly returning he hastened to unite with the French squadron at Brest and challenge the English fleet in the Channel. But a headlong pursuit by Lord Nelson up with him ere the manœuvre was complete, and the two fleets met on the 21st of October, 1805, off Cape Trafalgar.

1793
to
1815

"England," ran Nelson's famous signal, "expects every man to do his duty;" and though he fell himself in the hour of victory, twenty French sail had struck their flag ere the day was done. "England has saved herself by her courage," Pitt said in what were destined to be his last public words: "she will save Europe by her example!" But even before the victory of Trafalgar Napoleon had abandoned the dream of invading England to meet the coalition in his rear; and swinging round his forces on the Danube he forced an Austrian army to a shameful capitulation in Ulm three days before his final naval defeat. From Ulm he marched on Vienna, and crushed the combined armies of Austria and Russia in the battle of Austerlitz. "Austerlitz," Wilberforce wrote in his diary, "killed Pitt." Though he was still but forty-seven, the hollow voice and wasted frame of the great Minister had long told that death was near; and the blow to his hopes proved fatal. "Roll up that map," he said, pointing to a map of Europe which hung upon the wall; "it will not be wanted these ten years!" Once only he rallied from stupor; and those who bent over him caught a faint murmur of "My country! How I leave my country!" On the 23rd of January, 1806, he breathed his last; and was laid in Westminster Abbey in the grave of Chatham. "What grave," exclaimed Lord Wellesley, "contains such a father and such a son! What sepulchre embosoms the remains of so much human excellence and glory!"

Grenville
Ministry

So great was felt to be the loss that nothing but the union of parties, which Pitt had in vain desired during his lifetime, could fill up the gap left by his death. In the new Ministry Fox, with the small body of popular Whigs who were bent on peace and internal reform, united with the aristocratic Whigs under Lord Grenville and with the Tories under Lord Sidmouth. All home questions, in fact, were subordinated to the need of saving Europe from the ambition of France, and in the resolve to save Europe Fox was as resolute as Pitt himself. His hopes of peace, indeed, were stronger; but they were foiled by the evasive answer which Napoleon gave to his overtures, and by a new war which he undertook against Prussia, the one power which seemed able to resist the arms of France. By the fatal indecision of the Ministry Prussia was left unaided till it was too late to aid her; and on the 14th of October, 1806, the decisive victory of Jena laid North Germany at Napoleon's feet. Death had saved Fox only a month before from witnessing the overthrow of his hopes; and his loss weakened the Grenville Cabinet at the moment when one of its greatest errors opened a new and more desperate struggle with France. By a violent stretch of her rights as a combatant England declared the whole coast occupied by France and its allies, from Dantzic to Trieste, to be in a state of blockade. It was impossible to enforce such a "paper blockade," even by the immense force at her disposal; and Napoleon seized on the opportunity to retaliate by the entire exclusion of British commerce from the Continent, an exclusion

he trusted would end the war by the ruin it would bring on British manufacturers. Decrees issued from Berlin and Milan prohibited the seizure of all British exports and of vessels which had called at any British port. The result of these decrees would, he thought, prove the ruin of the carrying trade of Britain, which would fall into the hands of neutrals and especially of the Americans; and to prevent this result that the Grenville Ministry issued an Order in Council in January 1807 by which neutral vessels voyaging to or from British ports were subject to the blockade already declared were compelled to stop and be subject to seizure to touch previously at some British port. The result of a yet wider struggle lay in these Orders; but the fall of the Grenville Ministry was due not so much to its reckless foreign policy as to its wise and generous policy at home. Its greatest work, the abolition of the Slave Trade in February, was done in the teeth of the vigorous opposition from the Tories and the merchants of the West India Company; and the first indications of a desire to bring about the Emancipation of the West India Colonies was met on the part of the King by the refusal of a pledge not to meddle with the question, and by the resignation of the Ministry in March on their refusal to give it.

The dismissal of the Grenville Ministry broke up the union of Canning

and from this time to the end of the war England was governed by the Tories. The nominal head of the Ministry succeeded that of Lord Grenville was the Duke of Portland; the leading spirit was the Foreign Secretary, George Canning, a devoted adherent of Pitt, whose brilliant rhetoric gave power over the House of Commons, while the vigour and energy of his mind gave a new energy and colour to the war. At a time when opposition to Napoleon seemed so hopeless. From the Emperor's march into the heart of Poland, and though in the winter by the Russian forces in the hard fought battle of Eylau, his victory of Friedland brought the Czar Alexander in 1807 to consent to the Peace of Tilsit. From foes the Emperors of the West and the East became friends, and the French aid in the conquest of Turkey drew Alexander into an alliance with Napoleon. Russia not only enforced the decrees against British commerce, but forced Sweden, the only power which England still retained on the Continent, to renounce her neutrality. The Russian and Swedish fleets were thus placed at the disposal of France, and the two Emperors counted on securing the neutrality of Denmark, and threatening by this union the maritime supremacy which formed England's real defence. The hope was that the appearance off Elsinore in July 1807 of an expedition, strong and secretly equipped by Canning, with a demand for the surrender of the Danish fleet into the hands of England, on the refusal of its return at the close of the war. On the refusal of the demand was enforced by a bombardment of Copenhagen; the whole Danish fleet with a vast mass of naval stores were driven into British ports. But whatever Canning did to check France she could do nothing to arrest her progress on land. Napoleon

1793
to
1815

was drunk with success. He was absolutely master of Western Europe, and its whole face changed as at an enchanter's touch. Prussia was occupied by French troops. Holland was changed into a monarchy by a simple decree of the French Emperor, and its crown bestowed on his brother Louis. Another brother, Jerome, became King of Westphalia, a new realm built up out of the Electorates of Hesse Cassel and Hanover. A third brother, Joseph, was made King of Naples; while the rest of Italy, and even Rome itself, was annexed to the French Empire.

a Pen-
ular
r

As little opposition met Napoleon's first aggressions in the Peninsula. In the Treaty of Fontainebleau (Oct. 1807) France and Spain agreed to divide Portugal between them; and the reigning House of Braganza fled helplessly from Lisbon to a refuge in Brazil. But the seizure of Portugal was only meant as a prelude to the seizure of Spain. Charles the Fourth, whom a riot in his capital had driven to abdication, and his son Ferdinand the Seventh were drawn to Bayonne in May 1808 on pretext of an interview with the Emperor, and forced to resign their claims to the Spanish crown, while the French army entered Madrid and proclaimed Joseph Buonaparte King of Spain. This infamous act of treachery was hardly completed when Spain rose as one man against the stranger; and desperate as the effort of its people seemed, the news of the rising was welcomed throughout England with a burst of enthusiastic joy. "Hitherto," cried Sheridan, a leader of the Whig opposition, "Buonaparte has contended with princes without dignity, numbers without ardour, or peoples without patriotism. He has yet to learn what it is to combat a people who are animated by one spirit against him." Tory and Whig alike held that "never had so happy an opportunity existed for Britain to strike a bold stroke for the rescue of the world;" and Canning at once resolved to change the system of desultory descents on colonies and sugar islands for a vigorous warfare in the Peninsula. Supplies were sent to the Spanish insurgents with reckless profusion, and two small armies placed under the command of Sir John Moore and Sir Arthur Wellesley for service in the Peninsula. In July 1808 the surrender at Baylen of a French force which had invaded Andalusia gave the first shock to the power of Napoleon, and the blow was followed by one almost as severe. Landing at the Mondego with fifteen thousand men, Sir Arthur Wellesley drove the French army of Portugal from the field of Vimiera, and forced it to surrender in the Convention of Cintra on the 30th of August. In Spain itself the tide of success was soon roughly turned by the appearance of Napoleon with an army of two hundred thousand men; and Moore, who had advanced from Lisbon to Salamanca to support the Spanish armies, found them crushed on the Ebro, and was forced to fall hastily back on the coast. His force saved its honour in a battle before Corunna on the 16th of January, 1809, which enabled it to embark in safety; but elsewhere all seemed lost. The whole of northern and central Spain was held by the French armies; and

aragoza, which had once heroically repulsed them, submitted to a second desperate siege.

landing of the wreck of Moore's army and the news of Spanish defeats turned the temper of England from the wildest to the deepest despair; but Canning remained unmoved. On the day of the evacuation of Corunna he signed a treaty of alliance with the Spanish Junta at Cadiz; and the English force at Lisbon, which had already prepared to leave Portugal, was reinforced with ten thousand fresh troops and placed under the command of Arthur Wellesley. "Portugal," Wellesley wrote coolly, "may be defended against any force which the French can bring against it; at this critical moment the best of the French troops with the sword or himself were drawn from the Peninsula to the Danube;

1793
to
1815
—
Welles-
ley

Spanish rising had roused Austria as well as England to a part of the struggle. When Marshal Soult therefore threatened France from the north, Wellesley marched boldly against him, drove him from Oporto in a disastrous retreat, and suddenly changing his line of operations pushed with twenty thousand men against Madrid. He was joined on the march by a Spanish army of thirty thousand men; and a bloody action of two days destroyed the renown of French arms. The losses on both sides enormous, and the French fell back at the close of the struggle; the fruits of the victory were lost by the sudden appearance of Napoleon in the English line of advance, and Wellesley was forced to retreat hastily on Badajoz. His failure was embittered by heavier reverses elsewhere. Austria was driven to sue for peace by Napoleon's victory at Wagram; and a force of forty thousand British soldiers which had been despatched against Antwerp in 1805 returned home baffled after losing half its numbers in the battle of Walcheren.

The failure at Walcheren brought about the fall of the Portland Ministry. Canning attributed the disaster to the incompetence of Castlereagh, an Irish peer who after taking the chief part in negotiating about the union between England and Ireland had been appointed by the Duke of Portland to the post of Secretary at War; and the quarrel between the two Ministers ended in a duel and in their resignation of their offices (Sept. 1809). The Duke of Portland resigned, and a new Ministry was formed out of the more Tory members of the late administration under the guidance of Spencer Perceval, an industrious mediocrity of the narrowest type; the Duke of Wellington, a brother of the English general in Spain, became Foreign Secretary. But if Perceval and his colleagues lacked few of the higher qualities of statesmanship, they had a characteristic which in the actual position of English affairs was beyond all price. They were resolute to continue the war. The nation at large the fit of enthusiasm had been followed by a reaction of despair; and the City of London even petitioned for the withdrawal of the English forces from the Peninsula. Napoleon

Torres
Vedras

seemed irresistible, and now that Austria was crushed and England stood alone in opposition to him, the Emperor resolved to put an end to the strife by a strict enforcement of the Continental System and a vigorous prosecution of the war in Spain. Andalusia, the one province which remained independent, was invaded in the opening of 1810, and with the exception of Cadiz reduced to submission. Marshal Massena with a fine army of eighty thousand men marched upon Lisbon. Even Perceval abandoned all hope of preserving a hold on the Peninsula in face of these new efforts, and threw on Wellesley, who had been raised to the peerage as Lord Wellington after Talavera, the responsibility of resolving to remain there. But the cool judgment and firm temper which distinguished Wellington enabled him to face a responsibility from which weaker men would have shrunk. "I conceive," he answered, "that the honour and interest of our country require that we should hold our ground here as long as possible; and, please God, I will maintain it as long as I can." By the addition of Portuguese troops who had been trained under British officers, his army was now raised to fifty thousand men; and though his inferiority in force compelled him to look on while Massena reduced the frontier fortresses of Ciudad Rodrigo and Almeida, he inflicted on him a heavy check at the heights of Busaco, and finally fell back in October 1810 on three lines of defence which he had secretly constructed at Torres Vedras, along a chain of mountain heights crowned with redoubts and bristling with cannon. The position was impregnable; and able and stubborn as Massena was he found himself forced after a month's fruitless efforts to fall back in a masterly retreat; but so terrible were the privations of the French army in passing again through the wasted country that it was only with forty thousand men that he reached Ciudad Rodrigo in the spring of 1811. Reinforced by fresh troops, Massena turned fiercely to the relief of Almeida, which Wellington had besieged; but two days' bloody and obstinate fighting on the 5th of May, 1811, failed to drive the English army from its position at Fuentes d'Onoro, and the Marshal fell back on Salamanca and relinquished his effort to drive Wellington from Portugal.

England
and
America

Great as was the effect of Torres Vedras in restoring the spirit of the English people and in reviving throughout Europe the hope of resistance to the tyranny of Napoleon, its immediate result was little save the deliverance of Portugal. The French remained masters of all Spain save Cadiz and the eastern provinces, and even the east coast was reduced in 1811 by the vigour of General Suchet. An attempt of Wellington to retake Badajoz was foiled by the co-operation of the army of the South under Marshal Soult with that of the North under Marshal Marmont; and a fruitless attack on Almeida wasted the rest of the year. Not only was the French hold on Spain too strong to be shaken by the force at Wellington's disposal, but the Continental System of Napoleon was beginning to involve England in dangers which he was far from having fore-

his effort to exclude English exports from the Continent had been aided by the rise of a vast system of contraband trade, by contraband sales practised in the Prussian and Russian ports, and by the rapid development of the carrying trade under neutral flags. The British army itself was clad in great coats made at Leeds, and the shoes from Northampton. But if Napoleon's direct blow had failed to bring about any serious results, the Orders in Council with which the Grenville Ministry had attempted to restrict the transfer of the carrying trade from English to neutral vessels compelling all vessels on their way to ports under blockade at British harbours, had at once created serious embarrassment with America. A year after the issue of these Orders America declared war on both combatants by a Non-Intercourse Act (March 1808), which suspended all trade between either France or England and the United States. Napoleon adroitly met this measure by an offer to draw the restrictions he had imposed on neutral trade if America would compel England to show equal respect to her flag; but no concession could be obtained from the Perceval Cabinet. The animosity between the two countries was embittered by the assertion of America's side of a "right of search," which compelled American ships to surrender any British subjects who formed part of their crews and who were claimed as deserters from the English navy.

Napoleon fulfilled his pledge of removing all obstacles to free trade, and America repealed the Non-Intercourse Act as far as it related to France. But no corresponding concession could be obtained from the English Government; though the closing of the American ports inflicted a heavier blow on British commerce than the Orders could have aimed at preventing. During 1811 English exports were reduced by one-third of their whole value. In America the irritation at last brought about a cry for action, in spite of the resolute opposition of the New England States. The forced Congress to raise an army of twenty-five thousand men and to declare the impressment of seamen sailing under an American flag to be piracy. England at last consented to withdraw from the Council, but the concession was made too late to prevent the declaration of war on the part of the United States in 1812.

The moment when America entered into the great struggle was a moment in the history of mankind. Six days after President Madison issued his declaration of war, Napoleon crossed the Niemen to march to Moscow. Successful as his Continental System had been in stirring up war between England and America, it had been unsuccessful in breaking the alliance which he had made with Emperor Alexander at Tilsit and in forcing on a contest with England which was destined to be a fatal one. On the one hand, Napoleon was irritated by the refusal of Russia to enforce strictly the suspension of all trade with England, though such a suspension would have ruined the Russian landowners. On the other, the Czar was growing anxious at the advance of the French Empire which

1793
to
1815

Sala-
manca
and
Moscow

1793
to
1815

sprang from Napoleon's resolve to enforce his system by a seizure of the northern coasts. In 1811 Holland, the Hanseatic towns, part of Westphalia, and the Duchy of Oldenburg were successively annexed, and the Duchy of Mecklenburg threatened with seizure. A peremptory demand on the part of France for the entire cessation of intercourse with England brought the quarrel to a head; and preparations were made on both sides for a gigantic struggle. The best of the French soldiers were drawn from Spain to the frontier of Poland; and Wellington, whose army had been raised to a force of forty thousand Englishmen and twenty thousand Portuguese, profited by the withdrawal to throw off his system of defence and to assume an attitude of attack. Ciudad Rodrigo and Badajoz were taken by storm during the spring of 1812; and three days before Napoleon crossed the Niemen (June 24) in his march on Moscow, Wellington crossed the Agueda in a march on Salamanca. After a series of masterly movements on both sides, Marmont with the French army of the North attacked the English on the hills in the neighbourhood of that town (July 22). While marching round the right of the English position, the French left wing was left isolated; and with a sudden exclamation of "Marmont is lost!" Wellington flung on it the bulk of his force, crushed it, and drove the whole army from the field. The loss on either side was nearly equal, but failure had demoralized the French army; and its retreat forced Joseph to leave Madrid, and Soult to evacuate Andalusia and to concentrate the southern army on the eastern coast. While Napoleon was still pushing slowly over the vast plains of Poland, Wellington made his entry into Madrid in August, and began the siege of Burgos. The town however held out gallantly for a month, till the advance of the two French armies, now concentrated in the north and south of Spain, forced Wellington (Oct. 18) to a hasty retreat on the Portuguese frontier. A day later (Oct. 19) began the more fatal retreat of the Grand Army from Moscow. Victorious in the battle of Borodino, Napoleon had entered the older capital of Russia in triumph, and waited impatiently to receive proposals of peace from the Czar, when a fire kindled by its own inhabitants reduced the city to ashes. The French army was forced to fall back amidst the horrors of a Russian winter. Of the four hundred thousand combatants who formed the Grand Army at its first outset, only a few thousand recrossed the Niemen in December.

er-
al
istry
Gallantly as Napoleon was still to struggle against the foes who sprang up around him, his ruin became certain from the hour when he fell back from Moscow. But a new English Ministry reaped the glory of success in the long struggle with his ambition. A return of the King's madness had made it necessary in the beginning of 1811 to confer the Regency by Act of Parliament on the Prince of Wales; and the Whig sympathies of the Prince threatened the Perceval Cabinet with dismissal. The insecurity of their position told on the conduct of the war; for much of Wellington's apparent inactivity

1811 was really due to the hesitation and timidity of the
 rs at home. In May 1812 the assassination of Perceval by a
 named Bellingham brought about the fall of his Ministry
 sh efforts to install the Whigs in office. But the attempt was
 less as ever, and the old Ministry was restored under the
 ce of the Earl of Liverpool, a man of no great abilities, but
 ate, well informed, and endowed with a singular gift of
 ; discordant colleagues together. But the death of Perceval
 more than a mere change of Ministry. From that moment
 elopment of English life, which had been roughly arrested
 ? by the reaction against the French Revolution, began
 o take its natural course. The anti-revolutionary terror
 Burke did so much to rouse had spent most of its force by the
 the Peace of Amiens; and though the country was unani-
 n the after-struggle against the ambition of Buonaparte,
 al distress which followed on the renewal of the war revived
 ns of internal reform which had been set aside ever since the
 k of the French Revolution as Jacobinical. The natural
 of trade and commerce to the general wealth of the people
 was disturbed by the peculiar circumstances of the time.
 r enriched the landowner, the capitalist, the manufacturer,
 ner; but it impoverished the poor. It is indeed from the
 ars which lie between the Peace of Amiens and Waterloo
 e must date that war of classes, that social severance
 r rich and poor, between employers and employed, which
 ms the great difficulty of English politics.

increase of wealth was indeed enormous. England was sole
 s of the seas. The war had given her possession of the
 of Spain, of Holland, and of France; and if her trade was
 l for a time by the Berlin decrees, the efforts of Napoleon
 on rendered fruitless by the vast smuggling system which
 up along the coast of North Germany. In spite of the far
 rious blow which commerce received from the quarrel with
 , English exports nearly doubled in the last fifteen years of
 . Manufactures profited by the great discoveries of Watt
 cwright; and the consumption of raw cotton in the mills of
 ire rose during the same period from fifty to a hundred
 of pounds. The vast accumulation of capital, as well as
 stant recurrence of bad seasons at this time, told upon the
 nd forced agriculture into a feverish and unhealthy pros-

Wheat rose to famine prices, and the value of land rose
 ortion with the price of wheat. Inclosures went on with
 us rapidity; the income of every landowner was doubled,
 ie farmers were able to introduce improvements into the
 s of agriculture which changed the whole face of the
 . But if the increase of wealth was enormous, its distribu-
 ; partial. During the fifteen years which preceded Waterloo,
 iber of the population rose from ten to thirteen millions,
 ; rapid increase kept down the rate of wages, which would

1793
 to
 1815

The
 State
 of the
 Country

naturally have advanced in a corresponding degree with the increase in the national wealth. Even manufactures, though destined in the long run to benefit the labouring classes, seemed at first rather to depress them. One of the earliest results of the introduction of machinery was the ruin of a number of small trades which were carried on at home, and the pauperization of families who relied on them for support. In the winter of 1811 the terrible pressure of this transition from handicraft to machinery was seen in the Luddite, or machine-breaking, riots which broke out over the northern and midland counties; and which were only suppressed by military force. While labour was thus thrown out of its older grooves, and the rate of wages kept down at an artificially low figure by the rapid increase of population, the rise in the price of wheat, which brought wealth to the landowner and the farmer, brought famine and death to the poor, for England was cut off by the war from the vast corn-fields of the Continent or of America, which now-a-days redress from their abundance the results of a bad harvest. Scarcity was followed by a terrible pauperization of the labouring classes. The amount of the poor-rate rose fifty per cent.; and with the increase of poverty followed its inevitable result, the increase of crime.

revival
reform The sense both of national glory and of national suffering told, however feebly, on the course of politics at home. Under the Perceval Ministry a blind opposition had been offered by the Government to every project of change or reform: but the terror-struck reaction against the French Revolution which this opposition strove to perpetuate was even then passing away. The publication of the *Edinburgh Review* in 1802 by a knot of young lawyers at Edinburgh, (Brougham, Jeffrey, Horner, and Mackintosh,) marked the revival of the policy of constitutional and administrative progress which had been reluctantly abandoned by William Pitt. Jeremy Bentham gave a new vigour to political speculation by his advocacy of the doctrine of Utility, and his definition of "the greatest happiness of the greatest number" as the aim of political action. In 1809 Sir Francis Burdett revived the question of Parliamentary Reform. Only fifteen members supported his motion; and a reference to the House of Commons, in a pamphlet which he subsequently published, as "a part of our fellow-subjects collected together by means which it is not necessary to describe" was met by his committal to the Tower, where he remained till the prorogation of the Parliament. A far greater effect was produced by the perseverance with which Canning pressed year by year the question of Catholic Emancipation. So long as Perceval lived both efforts at Reform were equally vain; but on the accession of Lord Liverpool to power the advancing strength of a more liberal sentiment in the nation was felt by the policy of "moderate concession" which was adopted by the new Ministry. Catholic Emancipation became an open question in the Cabinet itself, and was adopted in 1812 by a triumphant

y in the House of Commons, though still rejected by the

1793

to

1815

—
Fall of
Napoleon

this moment, however, all questions of home politics were thrown into the background by the absorbing interest of the spite of the gigantic efforts which Napoleon made to repair of the Grand Army, the spell which he had cast over was broken by the retreat from Moscow. Prussia rose him as the Russian army advanced across the Niemen,

French were at once thrown back on the Elbe. In May Wellington again left Portugal with an army which had now ninety thousand men; and overtaking the French forces at at Vittoria inflicted on them a defeat (June 21) which them in utter rout across the Pyrenees. Madrid was at once ed; and Clauzel fell back from Zaragoza into France. The not only freed Spain from its invaders; it restored the the Allies at the darkest hour of their new fortunes. The of Napoleon rose to its height in his last campaigns. With army of two hundred thousand men whom he had gathered z he marched on the allied armies of Russia and Prussia in eared Saxony by a victory over them at Lutzen, and threw ck on the Oder by a fresh victory at Bautzen. Disheartened at, and by the neutral attitude which Austria still preserved,

powers consented in June to an armistice, and negotiated e; but the loss of Spain and Wellington's advance on the s gave a new vigour to their councils. The close of the e was followed by the union of Austria with the Allied ; and a terrible overthrow of Napoleon at Leipzig in forced the French army to cross the Rhine. Meanwhile the of San Sebastian and of Pampeluna, with the obstinate of Marshal Soult in the Pyrenees, held Wellington for a bay; and it was only in October that a victory on the a enabled him to enter France and to force Soult from his hed camp before Bayonne. But the war was now hurrying ose. On the last day of 1813 the allies crossed the Rhine, a month a third of France had passed without opposition ir hands. Soult, again defeated by Wellington at Orthez, x on Toulouse; and Bordeaux, then left uncovered, hardly the arrival of the English forces to hoist the white flag of rbons. On the 10th of April, 1814, Wellington again d Soult at Toulouse in an obstinate and indecisive engage- but though neither general knew it, the war was at that t at an end. The wonderful struggle which Napoleon with ul of men had maintained for two months against the over- g forces of the Allies closed with the surrender of Paris on of March; and the submission of the capital was at once d by the abdication of the Emperor and the return of the ns.

and's triumph over its great enemy was dashed by the more il fortunes of the struggle which Napoleon had kindled

across the Atlantic. The declaration of war by America in June 1812 seemed an act of sheer madness. The American navy consisted of a few frigates and sloops; its army was a mass of half-drilled and half-armed recruits; the States themselves were divided on the question of the war; and Connecticut with Massachusetts refused to send either money or men. Three attempts to penetrate into Canada during the summer and autumn were repulsed with heavy loss. But these failures were more than redeemed by unexpected successes at sea. In two successive engagements between English and American frigates, the former were forced to strike their flag. The effect of these victories was out of all proportion to their real importance; for they were the first heavy blows which had been dealt at England's supremacy over the seas. In 1813 America followed up its naval triumphs by more vigorous efforts on land. Its forces cleared Lake Ontario, captured Toronto, destroyed the British flotilla on Lake Erie, and made themselves masters of Upper Canada. An attack on Lower Canada, however, was successfully beaten back; and a fresh advance of the British and Canadian forces in the heart of the winter again recovered the Upper Province. The reverse gave fresh strength to the party in the United States which had throughout been opposed to the war, and whose opposition to it had been embittered by the terrible distress brought about by the blockade and the ruin of American commerce. Cries of secession began to be heard, and Massachusetts took the bold step of appointing delegates to confer with delegates from the other New England States "on the subject of their grievances and common concerns." In 1814, however, the war was renewed with more vigour than ever. Upper Canada was again invaded, but the American army, after inflicting a severe defeat on the British forces in the battle of Chippewa in July, was itself defeated a few weeks after in an equally stubborn engagement, and thrown back on its own frontier. The fall of Napoleon now enabled the English Government to devote its whole strength to the struggle with an enemy which it had at last ceased to despise. General Ross, with a force of four thousand men, appeared in the Potomac, captured Washington, and before evacuating the city burnt its public buildings to the ground. Few more shameful acts are recorded in our history; and it was the more shameful in that it was done under strict orders from the Government at home. The raid upon Washington, however, was intended simply to strike terror into the American people; and the real stress of the war was thrown on two expeditions whose business was to penetrate into the States from the north and from the south. Both proved utter failures. A force of nine thousand Peninsular veterans which marched in September to the attack of Plattsburg on Lake Champlain was forced to fall back by the defeat of the English flotilla which accompanied it. A second force under General Pakenham appeared in December at the mouth of the Mississippi and attacked New Orleans, but was repulsed by General Jackson

with the loss of half its numbers. Peace, however, had already been concluded. The close of the French war removed the causes of the struggle, and the claims, whether of the English or of the Americans, were set aside in silence in the new treaty of 1814.

The close of the war with America freed England's hands at a moment when the reappearance of Napoleon at Paris called her to a new and final struggle with France. By treaty with the Allied Powers Napoleon had been suffered to retain a fragment of his former empire—the island of Elba off the coast of Tuscany; and from Elba he had looked on at the quarrels which sprang up between his conquerors as soon as they gathered at Vienna to complete the settlement of Europe. The most formidable of these quarrels arose from the claim of Prussia to annex Saxony and that of Russia to annex Poland; but their union for this purpose was met by a counter-league of England and Austria with their old enemy, France, whose ambassador, Talleyrand, laboured vigorously in bringing the question to an issue by force of arms. At the moment, however, when a war between the two leagues seemed close at hand, Napoleon quitted Elba, landed on the 1st March, 1815, on the coast near Cannes, and, followed only by a thousand of his guards, marched over the mountains of Dauphiné upon Grenoble and Lyons. He counted, and counted justly, on the indifference of the country to its new Bourbon rulers, on the longing of the army for a fresh struggle which should restore its glory, and above all in the spell of his name over soldiers whom he had so often led to victory. Twenty days from his landing he reached the Tuileries unopposed, while Lewis the Eighteenth fled helplessly to Ghent. But whatever successes he had drawn from the divisions of the Allied Powers were once dispelled by their resolute action on the news of his descent on France. Their strife was hushed and their old union restored by the consciousness of a common danger. A Declaration adopted instantly by all put Napoleon to the ban of Europe. "In breaking a convention which had established him in the island of Elba, Bonaparte has destroyed the sole legal title to which his political existence is attached. By reappearing in France with projects of subversion and overthrow he has not less deprived himself of the protection of the laws, and made it evident in the face of the universe that there can no longer be either peace or truce with him. The Powers, therefore, declare that Buonaparte has placed himself out of the pale of civil and social relations, and that as the general enemy and disturber of the world he is abandoned to public justice." The engagement to supply a million of men for the purposes of the war, and a recall of their armies to the Rhine, gave practical effect to the words of the Allies. England furnished subsidies to the amount of eleven millions to support these enormous hosts, and hastened to place an army on the frontier of the Netherlands. The British troops of the force which had been employed in the Peninsula, however, were still across the Atlantic; and of the eighty thousand men who gathered round Wellington only about a half were English-

1793
to
1815

Return
of
Napo-
leon

1793 men, the rest principally raw levies from Belgium and Hanover.
to The Duke's plan was to unite with the one hundred and fifty
1815 thousand Prussians under Marshal Blucher who were advancing
on the Lower Rhine, and to enter France by Mons and Namur
while the forces of Austria and Russia closed in upon Paris by way
of Belfort and Elsass.

Waterloo But Napoleon had thrown aside all thought of a merely defensive war. By amazing efforts he had raised an army of two hundred and fifty thousand men in the few months since his arrival in Paris; and in the opening of June one hundred and twenty thousand Frenchmen were concentrated on the Sambre at Charleroi, while Wellington's troops still lay in cantonments on the line of the Scheldt from Ath to Nivelles, and Blucher's on that of the Meuse from Nivelles to Liege. Both the allied armies hastened to unite at Quatre Bras; but their junction was already impossible. Blucher with eighty thousand men was himself attacked on the 16th by Napoleon at Ligny, and after a desperate contest driven back with terrible loss upon Wavre. On the same day Ney with twenty thousand men, and an equal force under D'Erlon in reserve, appeared before Quatre Bras, where as yet only ten thousand English and the same force of Belgian troops had been able to assemble. The Belgians broke before the charges of the French horse; but the dogged resistance of the English infantry gave time for Wellington to bring up corps after corps, till at the close of the day Ney saw himself heavily outnumbered, and withdrew baffled from the field. About five thousand men had fallen on either side in this fierce engagement: but heavy as was Wellington's loss, the firmness of the English army had already done much to foil Napoleon's effort at breaking through the line of the Allies. Blucher's retreat, however, left the English flank uncovered; and on the following day, while the Prussians were falling back on Wavre, Wellington with nearly seventy thousand men—for his army was now well in hand—withdrew in good order upon Waterloo, followed by the mass of the French forces under the Emperor himself. Napoleon had detached Marshal Grouchy with thirty thousand men to hang upon the rear of the beaten Prussians, while with a force of eighty thousand men he resolved to bring Wellington to battle. On the morning of the 18th of June the two armies faced one another on the field of Waterloo in front of the forest of Soignies, on the high road to Brussels. Napoleon's one fear had been that of a continued retreat. "I have them!" he cried, as he saw the English line drawn up on a low rise of ground which stretched across the high road from the château of Hougomont on its right to the farm and straggling village of La Haye Sainte on its left. He had some grounds for his confidence of success. On either side the forces numbered between seventy and eighty thousand men: but the French were superior in guns and cavalry, and a large part of Wellington's force consisted of Belgian levies who broke and fled at the outset of the fight. A fierce attack

pon Hougomont opened the battle at eleven; but it was not till midday that the corps of D'Erlon advanced upon the centre near a Haye Sainte, which from that time bore the main brunt of the struggle. Never has greater courage, whether of attack or endurance, been shown on any field than was shown by both combatants at Waterloo. The columns of D'Erlon, repulsed by the English foot, were hurled back in disorder by a charge of the Scots Greys; but the victorious horsemen were crushed in their turn by the French cuirassiers, and the mass of the French cavalry, twelve thousand strong, flung itself in charge after charge on the English front, carrying the English guns and sweeping with desperate savagery round the unbroken squares whose fire thinned their ranks. With almost equal bravery the French columns of the centre again advanced, wrested at last the farm of La Haye Sainte from their opponents, and pushed on vigorously though in vain under Ney against the troops in its rear. Terrible as was the English loss—and many of his regiments were reduced to a mere handful of men—Wellington stubbornly held his ground while the Prussians, advancing, as they promised, from Wavre through deep and miry forest roads, were slowly gathering to his support, disregarding the attack on their rear by which Grouchy strove to hold them back on the field. At half-past four their advanced guard deployed last from the woods; but the main body was still far behind, and Napoleon was still able to hold his ground against them till their increasing masses forced him to stake all on a desperate effort against the English front. The Imperial Guard—his only reserve, and which had as yet taken no part in the battle—was drawn up at seven in two huge columns of attack. The first, with Ney himself at its head, swept all before it as it mounted the rise beside La Haye Sainte, on which the thin English line still held its ground, and all but touched the English front when its mass, torn by the terrible fire of musketry with which it was received, gave way before a charge from the English Guards. The second, three thousand strong, advanced with the same courage over the slope near Hougomont, only to be shattered and repulsed in the same way. At the moment when these masses, shattered but still unconquered, were slowly and doggedly back down the fatal rise, the Prussians rushed forward some forty thousand strong on Napoleon's right, their guns swept the road to Charleroi, and Wellington seized the moment for a general advance. From that moment all was lost. Only the Old Guard stood firm in the wreck of the French army; nothing but night and exhaustion checked the English in their pursuit of the broken masses who hurried from the field. The Prussian horse continued the chase through the night, and only twenty thousand Frenchmen with some thirty guns recrossed the frontier. Napoleon himself fled hurriedly to Paris, and his second flight was followed by the triumphant entry of the English and Prussian armies into the French capital.

EPILOGUE

1815 With the victory of Waterloo we reach a time within the memory
to of some now living, and the opening of a period of our history, the
1873 greatest indeed of all in real importance and interest, but perhaps
too near to us as yet to admit of a cool and purely historical
treatment. In a work such as the present at any rate it will be
advisable to limit ourselves from this point to a brief summary of
the more noteworthy events which have occurred in our political
history since 1815.

The Peace The peace which closed the great war with Napoleon left Britain
feverish and exhausted. Of her conquests at sea she retained only
Malta, (whose former possessors, the Knights of St. John, had
ceased to exist,) the Dutch colonies of Ceylon and the Cape of Good
Hope, the French colony of Mauritius, and a few West India
islands. On the other hand the pressure of the heavy taxation and
of the debt, which now reached eight hundred millions, was em-
bittered by the general distress of the country. The rapid develop-
ment of English industry for a time ran ahead of the world's
demands; the markets at home and abroad were glutted with
unsaleable goods, and mills and manufactories were brought to a
standstill. The scarcity caused by a series of bad harvests was
intensified by the selfish legislation of the landowners in Parlia-
ment. Conscious that the prosperity of English agriculture was
merely factitious, and rested on the high price of corn produced
by the war, they prohibited by an Act passed in 1815 the intro-
duction of foreign corn till wheat had reached famine prices.
Society, too, was disturbed by the great changes of employment
consequent on a sudden return to peace after twenty years of war,
and by the disbanding of the immense forces employed at sea and
on land. The movement against machinery which had been put
down in 1812 revived in the formidable riots of the Luddites, and
the distress of the rural poor brought about a rapid increase of
crime. The steady opposition too of the Administration, in which
Lord Castlereagh's influence was now supreme, to any project of
political progress created a dangerous irritation which brought to
the front men whose demand of a "radical reform" in English
institutions won them the name of Radicals, and drove more
violent agitators into treasonable disaffection and silly plots. In
1819 the breaking up by military force of a meeting at Manchester,
assembled for the purpose of advocating a reform in Parliament,
increased the unpopularity of the Government; and a plot of some
desperate men with Arthur Thistlewood at their head for the
assassination of the whole Ministry, which is known as the Cato-
Street Conspiracy (1820), threw light on the violent temper which

was springing up among its more extreme opponents. The death of George the Third in 1820, and the accession of his son the Prince Regent as George the Fourth, only added to the general disturbance of men's minds. The new King had long since forsaken his wife and privately charged her with infidelity; his first act on mounting the throne was to renew his accusations against her, and to lay before Parliament a bill for the dissolution of her marriage with him. The public agitation which followed on this step at last forced the Ministry to abandon the bill, but the shame of the royal family and the unpopularity of the King increased the general discontent of the country.

1815
to
1873

The real danger to public order, however, lay only in the blind Canning opposition to all political change which confused wise and moderate projects of reform with projects of revolution; and in 1822 the suicide of Lord Castlereagh, who had now become Marquis of Londonderry, and to whom this opposition was mainly due, put an end to the policy of mere resistance. Canning became Foreign Secretary in Castlereagh's place, and with Canning returned the earlier and progressive policy of William Pitt. Abroad, his first act was to break with the "Holy Alliance," as it called itself, which the continental courts had formed after the overthrow of Napoleon for the repression of revolutionary or liberal movements in their kingdoms, and whose despotic policy had driven Naples, Spain, and Portugal in 1820 into revolt. Canning asserted the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of foreign states, a principle he enforced by sending troops in 1826 to defend Portugal from Spanish intervention, while he recognized the revolted colonies of Spain in South America and Mexico as independent states. At home his influence was seen in the new strength gained by the restoration of Catholic Emancipation, and in the passing of a bill giving relief to Roman Catholics through the House of Commons in 1825. With the entry of his friend Mr. Huskisson into office in 1823 began a commercial policy which was founded on a conviction of the benefits derived from freedom of trade, and which brought about at a later time the repeal of the Corn Laws. The new drift of public policy produced a division among the Ministers which showed itself openly at Lord Liverpool's death in 1827. Canning became first Lord of the Treasury, but the Duke of Wellington, with the Chancellor, Lord Eldon, and the Home Secretary, Mr. Peel, refused to serve under him; and four months after the formation of Canning's Ministry it was broken up by his death. A temporary Ministry formed under Lord Goderich on Canning's principles was once weakened by the position of foreign affairs. A revolt of the Greeks against Turkey had now lasted some years in spite of Canning's efforts to bring about peace, and the despatch of an Egyptian expedition with orders to devastate the Morea and carry its inhabitants as slaves forced England, France, and Russia to interfere. In 1827 their united fleet under Admiral Codrington attacked and destroyed that of Egypt in the bay of Navarino; but

1815 the blow at Turkey was disapproved by English opinion, and the
to
1873 Ministry, already wanting in Parliamentary strength, was driven
to resign (1828).

Reform The formation of a purely Tory Ministry by the Duke of Wellington, with Mr. Peel for its principal support in the Commons, was generally looked on as a promise of utter resistance to all further progress. But the state of Ireland, where a "Catholic Association" formed by Daniel O'Connell maintained a growing agitation, had now reached a point when the English Ministry had to choose between concession and civil war. The Duke gave way, and brought in a bill which, like that designed by Pitt, admitted Roman Catholics to Parliament, and to all but a few of the highest posts, civil or military, in the service of the Crown. The passing of this bill in 1829 by the aid of the Whigs threw the Tory party into confusion; while the cry for Parliamentary Reform was suddenly revived with a strength it had never known before by a Revolution in France in 1830, which drove Charles the Tenth from the throne and called his cousin, Louis Philippe, the Duke of Orleans, to reign as a Constitutional King. William the Fourth, who succeeded to the crown on the death of his brother, George the Fourth, at this moment (1830) was favourable to the demand of Reform, but Wellington refused all concession. The refusal drove him from office; and for the first time after twenty years the Whigs saw themselves again in power under the leadership of Earl Grey. A bill for Parliamentary Reform, which took away the right of representation from fifty-six decayed or rotten boroughs, gave the 143 members it gained to counties or large towns which as yet sent no members to Parliament, established a £10 householder qualification for voters in boroughs, and extended the county franchise to leaseholders and copyholders, was laid before Parliament in 1831. On its defeat the Ministry appealed to the country. The new House of Commons at once passed the bill, and so terrible was the agitation produced by its rejection by the Lords, that on its subsequent re-introduction the Peers who opposed it withdrew and suffered it to become law (June 7, 1832). The Reformed Parliament which met in 1833 did much by the violence and inexperience of many of its new members, and especially by the conduct of O'Connell, to produce a feeling of reaction in the country. On the resignation of Lord Grey in 1834 the Ministry was reconstituted under the leadership of Viscount Melbourne; and though this administration was soon dismissed by the King, whose sympathies had now veered round to the Tories, and succeeded for a short time by a Ministry under Sir Robert Peel (Nov. 1834—April 1835), a general election again returned a Whig Parliament, and replaced Lord Melbourne in office. Weakened as it was by the growing change of political feeling throughout the country, no Ministry has ever wrought greater and more beneficial changes than the Whig Ministry under Lord Grey and Lord Melbourne during its ten years of rule from 1831 to 1841. In 1833 the system of slavery which still existed in

the British colonies, though the Slave Trade was suppressed, was abolished at a cost of twenty millions; the commercial monopoly of the East India Company was abolished, and the trade to the East thrown open to all merchants. In 1834 the growing evil of pauperism was checked by the enactment of a New Poor Law. In 1835 the Municipal Corporations Act restored to the inhabitants of towns those rights of self-government of which they had been deprived since the fourteenth century. 1836 saw the passing of the General Registration Act, while the constant quarrels over the grievances of Dissenters redressed by a measure which allowed civil marriage. A system of national education, begun in 1834 by a small annual grant towards the erection of schools, was developed in 1839 by the creation of a Committee of the Privy Council for educational purposes and by the steady increase of educational grants.

1815
to
1873

Great however as these measures were, the difficulties of the Peel Whig Ministry grew steadily year by year. Ireland, where O'Connell maintained an incessant agitation for the Repeal of the Union, could only be held down by Coercion Acts. In spite of the impulse given to trade by the system of steam communication which began with the opening of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway in 1830, the country still suffered from distress: and the discontent of the poorer classes gave rise in 1839 to riotous demands for "the people's Charter," including universal suffrage, vote by ballot, annual Parliaments, equal electoral districts, the abolition of all property qualification for members, and payment for their services. In Canada a quarrel between the two districts of Upper and Lower Canada was suffered through mismanagement to grow into a formidable revolt. The vigorous but meddlesome way in which Lord Palmerston, a disciple of Canning, carried out that statesman's foreign policy, supporting Donna Maria as sovereign in Portugal and Isabella as Queen in Spain against claimants of more absolutist tendencies by a Quadruple Alliance with France and the two countries of the Peninsula, and forcing Mehemet Ali, the Pacha of Egypt, to withdraw from an attack on Turkey by the bombardment of Acre in 1840, created general uneasiness; while the public conscience was wounded by a war with China in 1839 on its refusal to allow the smuggling of opium into its dominions. A more terrible blow was given to the Ministry by events in India; where the occupation of Cabul in 1839 ended two years later in a general revolt of the Afghans and in the loss of a British army in the Hyber Pass. The strength of the Government was restored for a time by the death of William the Fourth in 1837 and the accession of Victoria, the daughter of his brother Edward, Duke of Kent. With the accession of Queen Victoria ended the union of England and Hanover under the same sovereigns, the latter state passing to the next male heir, Ernest, Duke of Cumberland. But the Whig hold on the House of Commons passed steadily away, and a general

1815
to
1873

election in 1841 gave their opponents, who now took the name of Conservatives, a majority of nearly a hundred members. The general confidence in Sir Robert Peel, who was placed at the head of the Ministry which followed that of Lord Melbourne, enabled him to deal vigorously with two of the difficulties which had most hampered his predecessors. The disorder of the public finances was repaired by the repeal of a host of oppressive and useless duties and by the imposition of an Income Tax. In Ireland O'Connell was charged with sedition and convicted, and though subsequently released from prison on appeal to the House of Lords, his influence received a shock from which it never recovered. Peace was made with China by a treaty which threw open some of its ports to traders of all nations; and in India the disaster of Cabul was avenged by an expedition under General Pollock which penetrated victoriously to the capital of that country in 1842. The shock, however, to the English power brought about fresh struggles for supremacy with the natives, and especially with the Sikhs, who were crushed for the time in three great battles at Moodkee, Ferozeshah, and Sobraon (1845 and 1846) and the province of Scinde annexed to the British dominions.

Free
Trade

Successful as it proved itself abroad, the Conservative Government encountered unexpected difficulties at home. From the enactment of the Corn Laws in 1815 a dispute had constantly gone on between those who advocated these and similar measures as a protection to native industry and those who, viewing them as simply laying a tax on the consumer for the benefit of the producer, claimed entire freedom of trade with the world. In 1839 an Anti-Corn-Law League had been formed to enforce the views of the advocates of free trade; and it was in great measure the alarm of the farmers and landowners at its action which had induced them to give so vigorous a support to Sir Robert Peel. But though Peel entered office pledged to protective measures, his own mind was slowly veering round to a conviction of their inexpediency; and in 1846 the failure of the potato crop in Ireland and of the harvest in England forced him to introduce a bill for the repeal of the Corn Laws. The bill passed, but the resentment of his own party soon drove him from office; and he was succeeded by a Whig Ministry under Lord John Russell which remained in power till 1852. The first work of this Ministry was to carry out the policy of free trade into every department of British commerce; and from that time to this the maxim of the League, to "buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest," has been accepted as the law of our commercial policy. Other events were few. The general overthrow of the continental monarchs in the Revolution of 1848 found faint echoes in a feeble rising in Ireland under Smith O'Brien which was easily suppressed by a few policemen, and in a demonstration of the Chartists in London which passed off without further disturbance. A fresh war with the Sikhs in 1848 was closed by the victory of Goojerat and the annexation of the Punjaub in the following year.

The long peace which had been maintained between the European powers since the treaties of 1815 was now drawing to a close. In 1852 the Ministry of Lord John Russell was displaced by a short return of the Conservatives to power under Lord Derby; but a union of the Whigs with the Free Trade followers of Sir Robert Peel restored them to office at the close of 1852. Lord Aberdeen, the head of the new administration, was at once compelled to resist the attempts of Russia to force on Turkey a humiliating treaty; and in 1854 England allied herself with Louis Napoleon, who had declared himself Emperor of the French, to resist the invasion of the Danubian Principalities by a Russian army. The army was withdrawn; but in September the allied force landed on the shores of the Crimea, and after a victory at the river Alma undertook the siege of Sebastopol. The garrison however soon proved as strong as the besiegers, and as fresh Russian forces reached the Crimea the Allies found themselves besieged in their turn. An attack on the English position at Inkermann on November the 5th was repulsed with the aid of a French division; but winter proved more terrible than the Russian sword, and the English force wasted away with cold or disease. The public indignation at its sufferings forced the Aberdeen Ministry from office in the opening of 1855; and Lord Palmerston became Premier with a Ministry which excluded those members of the last administration who were held to be most in earnest in the prosecution of the war. After a siege of nearly a year the Allies at last became masters of Sebastopol in September, and Russia, spent with the strife, consented in 1856 to the Peace of Paris. The military reputation of England had fallen low during the struggle, and to this cause the mutiny of the native troops in Bengal, which quickly followed in 1857, may partly be attributed. Russian intrigues, Moslem fanaticism, resentment at the annexation of the kingdom of Oude by Lord Dalhousie, and a fanatical belief on the part of the Hindoos that the English Government had resolved to make them Christians by forcing them to lose their caste, have all been assigned as causes of an outbreak which still remains mysterious. A mutiny at Meerut in May 1857 was followed by the seizure of Delhi where the native king was enthroned as Emperor of Hindostan, by a fresh mutiny and massacre of the Europeans at Cawnpore, by the rising of Oude and the siege of the Residency at Lucknow. The number of English troops in India was small, and for the moment all Eastern and Central Hindostan seemed lost; but Madras, Bombay, and the Mynjah remained untouched, and the English in Bengal and Oude not only held their ground but marched upon Delhi, and in September took the town by storm. Two months later the arrival of reinforcements under Sir Colin Campbell relieved Lucknow, which had been saved till now by the heroic advance of Sir Henry Havelock with a handful of troops, and cleared Oude of the rebels. The suppression of the revolt was followed by a change in the government of India, which was transferred in 1858 from

1815
to
1873

Russian
and
Sepoy
Wars

1815
to
1873

—
Lord
Palmer-
ston

the Company to the Crown; the Queen being formally proclaimed its sovereign, and the Governor-General becoming her Viceroy.

The credit which Lord Palmerston won during the struggle with Russia and the Sepoys was shaken by his conduct in proposing an alteration in the law respecting conspiracies in 1858, in consequence of an attempt to assassinate Napoleon the Third which was believed to have originated on English ground. The violent language of the French army brought about a movement for the enlistment of a Volunteer force, which soon reached a hundred and fifty thousand men; and so great was the irritation it caused that the bill, which was thought to have been introduced in deference to the demands of France, was rejected by the House of Commons. Lord Derby again became Prime Minister for a few months; but a fresh election in 1859 brought back Lord Palmerston, whose Ministry lasted till his death in 1865. At home his policy was one of pure inaction; and his whole energy was directed to the preservation of English neutrality in five great strifes which distracted not only Europe but the New World, a war between France and Austria in 1859 which ended in the creation of the kingdom of Italy, a civil war in America which began with the secession of the Southern States in 1861 and ended four years later in their subjugation, an insurrection of Poland in 1863, an attack of France upon Mexico, and of Austria and Prussia upon Denmark in 1864. The American war, by its interference with the supply of cotton, reduced Lancashire to distress; while the fitting out of piratical cruisers in English harbours in the name of the Southern Confederation gave America just grounds for an irritation which was only allayed at a far later time. Peace, however, was successfully preserved; and the policy of non-intervention was pursued after Lord Palmerston's death by his successor, Lord Russell, who remained neutral during the brief but decisive conflict between Prussia and Austria in 1866 which transferred to the former the headship of Germany.

The
New Re-
formers

With Lord Palmerston, however, passed away the policy of political inaction which distinguished his rule. Lord Russell had long striven to bring about a further reform of Parliament; and in 1866 he laid a bill for that purpose before the House of Commons, whose rejection was followed by the resignation of the Ministry. Lord Derby, who again became Prime Minister, with Mr. Disraeli as leader of the House of Commons, found himself however driven to introduce in 1867 a Reform Bill of a far more sweeping character than that which had failed in Lord Russell's hands. By this measure, which passed in August 1867, the borough franchise was extended to all ratepayers, as well as to lodgers occupying rooms of the annual value of £10; the county franchise was fixed at £12, thirty-three members were withdrawn from English boroughs, twenty-five of whom were transferred to English counties, and the rest assigned to Scotland and Ireland. Large numbers of the working classes were thus added to the constituencies; and the indirect effect of this great measure was at once seen in the vigorous policy

f the Parliament which assembled after the new elections in 1868. Mr. Disraeli, who had become Prime Minister on the withdrawal of Lord Derby, retired quietly on finding that a Liberal majority of over one hundred members had been returned to the House of Commons; and his place was taken by Mr. Gladstone, at the head of a Ministry which for the first time included every section of the Liberal party. A succession of great measures proved the strength and energy of the new administration. Its first work was with Ireland, whose chronic discontent it endeavoured to remove by the disestablishment and disendowment of the Protestant Church in 1869, and by a Land Bill which established a sort of tenant-right in every part of the country in 1870. The claims of the Non-conformists were met in 1868 by the abolition of compulsory church-rates, and in 1871 by the abolition of all religious tests for admission to offices or degrees in the Universities. Important reforms were undertaken in the management of the navy; and a plan for the entire reorganization of the army was carried into effect after the system of promotion to its command by purchase had been put an end to. In 1870 the question of national education was furthered by a bill which provided for the establishment of school Boards in every district, and for their support by means of local rates. In 1872 a fresh step in Parliamentary reform was made by the passing of a measure which enabled the votes of electors to be given in secret by means of the ballot. The greatness and rapidity of these changes, however, produced so rapid a reaction in the minds of the constituencies that on the failure of his attempt to pass a bill for organizing the higher education of Ireland, Mr. Gladstone felt himself forced in 1874 to consult public opinion by the dissolution of Parliament; and the return of a Conservative majority of nearly seventy members was necessarily followed by his retirement from office, Mr. Disraeli again becoming First Minister of the Crown.

1815
to
1873

A POLITICAL AND SOCIAL SURVEY

FROM 1815-1914. BY R. P. FARLEY

CHAPTER I

FROM WATERLOO TO THE REFORM BILL

1815-1832

[*Authorities.*—An immense amount of material, which shows no sign of slackening, has been accumulated for the study of the whole of the nineteenth century, especially its closing period. For 1815-1832 the student must consult the "Annual Register" and the "Parliamentary Debates" for particular events. The general history is to be found in Walpole's "History of England from the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815"; J. A. L. Marriott's "England since Waterloo"; and Justin MacCarthy's "Modern England before the Reform Bill (1810-1832)." These should be supplemented by Broderick and Fotheringham's "Political History of England (1801-1837)," and E. and A. G. Porritt's "Unreformed House of Commons," while Dicey's "Law and Public Opinion" is an invaluable commentary on the course of legislative evolution. Special aspects of the period are treated in Cunningham's "English Industry and Commerce"; Levi's "History of Commerce" and "Wages and Earnings of the Working Classes"; Arnold Toynbee's "Industrial Revolution"; the Reports of the Select Committees on Agriculture (1814, 1821-1822); Hasbach's "The History of the English Agricultural Labourer"; J. L. and B. Hammond's "The Village Labourer (1760-1832)"; and Cobbett's "Political Register" (the last three describe the condition of the labouring classes). S. and B. Webb's "Trade Unionism" and Hutchins' and Harrison's "Factory Legislation" deal with efforts for the amelioration of industrial conditions, whether in the shape of working-class organisation or of legislation. Much light is thrown upon the events between Waterloo and the Reform Bill in Greville's "Journals of the Reigns of George IV. and William IV." and J. W. Croker's "Correspondence and Diaries" (edited Jennings). The part played by particular leaders may be studied in Bagot's "George Canning and his Friends"; the "Private Papers of Sir Robert Peel" (edited C. S. Parker); Lord Dalling and E. Ashley's "Life of Viscount Palmerston"; Podmore's "Life of Robert Owen"; G. Wallas' "Life of Francis Place."]

By the overthrow of Napoleon in 1815, England brought peace to Europe and secured for herself the lordship of the seas and the commercial supremacy of the world at that time. But precisely during the period of struggle with despotism abroad, internal changes of the most profound character had taken place in England, changes which transformed an agricultural to a manufacturing country, and which, though bringing with them much that was good, created a series of domestic problems of the gravest and most far-reaching character, so far-reaching that at the end of the century many of them still remained unsolved. During the period from 1790 to 1812 the fortunate possessors of agricultural land found their rents increase, in some cases five-fold. But if the position of the tenant farmer was bad, owing to high rents and a heavy income tax, that of the labourer was infinitely worse. During the reign of George III. 3200 Enclosure Acts were passed

d more than 6,000,000 acres were enclosed. It is true that more scientific methods of agriculture were introduced, but the tillager was deprived of his little plot of land and garden and of his common rights. Henceforth he had to depend entirely upon the scanty wages of daily labour, frequently supplemented by doles from private charity or the poor rates. Professor Levi calculates that from 1760 to 1813 wages rose 60 per cent., but against this increase must be set off a rise of 130 per cent. in the price of wheat.¹ The supersession of small farms by large also affected the labourer's budget. Formerly he was able to buy milk, butter, and other necessities in every parish in such quantity as his exiguous means allowed. Now the large farmer carried his commodities to the towns, and was often unwilling to sell, even to his own labourers, the small quantities which alone the workmen could afford to buy at one time. The pernicious system introduced by the Berkshire Justices of the Peace at Speenhamland on 6th May, 1795, was gradually adopted in almost every part of England, and remained in general use until swept away by the Poor Law reforms of 1834. The meeting of the Justices, though summoned for the express purpose of calling upon employers to give wages which reached a subsistence level, had the fatal unwisdom to decide that in cases where employers failed to do this they would make an allowance to every poor family in accordance with its members. "When the gallon loaf of second flour, weighing 8 lbs. 10 ozs., shall cost 1s., then every poor and industrious man shall receive for his own support 3s. weekly, either produced by his own or his family's labour, or an allowance from the poor rates, and for the support of his wife and every other of his family 1s. 6d. When the gallon loaf shall cost 1s. 4d., then every poor and industrious man shall have 4s. weekly for his own and 1s. 10d. for the support of every other of his family. And so in proportion as the price of bread rises or falls (that is to say) 3 per cent. to the man and 1 per cent. to every other of the family, on every penny which the loaf rises above a shilling." The effect of this method, unfortunately soon and so frequently to be imitated elsewhere, was disastrous, and was a potent source of demoralisation both to the employer, whom it relieved of the responsibility of paying subsistence wages, and to the labourer, in whom it encouraged habits of thriftlessness. Now the employer made use of the Speenhamland principle may be inferred from the fact that in 1814 the amount expended on Poor Law relief had reached the total of 12s. 8d. per head of the population, whereas at the beginning of the reign of George III. the figure stood at 3s. 7d. For the year ending March 31, 1818, the amount was 13s. 9d. per head of population. The labourer, forcibly divorced from his plot of land and demoralised by doles, only too soon lost his sturdy independence. The economic reaction which intervened on the close of war increased his distress and dissatisfaction. His grievances began to find articulate form in the

¹ "Large and Small Holdings," p. 11.

1815
to
1832

writings of William Cobbett, a consummate master of terse and vigorous English, whose weekly "Political Register" strove to teach the workmen of both town and country that a reform of Parliament would bring about a redress of their evils. Cobbett, the general accuracy of whose pictures of working-class life cannot be questioned, thus describes¹ the conditions in his own district in Sussex: "I have the good fortune to live in a part of the country where the labouring people are better off than in any part of England I have seen. . . . (Indeed, until the last three years, very little distress was known here) But now it has found us out, and threatens to involve us in one general mass of misery. I could name numerous individuals who are actually become a sort of skeletons. . . . I see scores of young men, framed by nature to be athletic, rosy-cheeked, and bold. I see scores of young men formed by nature to exhibit this appearance: I see them as thin as herrings, dragging their feet after them, pale as a ceiling and sneaking about like beggars."

The events of the generation immediately preceding the war, and especially the policy of enclosures, had substituted for the peasant with some vested rights in his village and some share in its government the mere labourer, robbed of his status, stripped of his common rights, broken in spirit. A contemporary picture, sombre in its colours, is yet no unfair description of one aspect of a typical village. "Go to an ale-house kitchen of an old enclosed country, and there you will see the origin of poverty and poor rates. For whom are they to be sober? For whom are they to save? For the parish? If I am diligent shall I have leave to build a cottage? If I am sober, shall I have land for a cow? If I am frugal, shall I have half an acre of potatoes? You offer no motives; you have nothing but a parish officer and a workhouse! Bring me another pot——"²

the In-
ustrial
evolu-
on

During the war that rapid change which has come to be known as "the industrial revolution" had transformed England from an agricultural to a manufacturing country. In 1769, the same year in which Napoleon and Wellington were born, Watts patented his steam-engine. Hargreaves' invention of the spinning-jenny (1770), Arkwright's of the "Water-frame" (1771), Crompton's of "the Mule," combining the principles of both the preceding (1779), and Cartwright's of the power-loom (1785) destroyed the old domestic worker and substituted the method of production in factories. In the 15 years from 1788 to 1803 the cotton trade trebled itself. The employment of steam power in mills necessitated the use of coal and made proximity to mines desirable. Hence manufacture tended to gravitate towards the great coal and iron fields of Yorkshire, Lancashire, Staffordshire, and South Wales. Simultaneously with the change in the cotton industry, new

¹ "Political Register," August 10, 1816.

² "Annals of Agriculture," vol. xxxvi. p. 508, quoted in Hammond's "Village Labourer," p. 105.

methods began to be applied to mining. And the greater demand for coal in its turn brought about a revival and an enormous increase of the trade in iron. The population of England in 1760 was under 8,000,000, but in 1821 it had risen to nearly 12,000,000, and the migration of the workers to the new manufacturing districts was no less remarkable than the extraordinary rise in their numbers. All through the war period the rate of industrial production and the volume of exports went up by leaps and bounds.

1793 exports were valued at over £17,000,000, in 1815 they had mounted up to £58,000,000. Nevertheless the manual workers suffered grievously as the bulk of the profits went into the pockets of capitalist manufacturers, every necessity of life was heavily taxed, the price of wheat, which in 1793 had been 49s. 3d. per quarter, had risen to 106s. in 1810, while at the close of the war prices rapidly fell. The conditions of the worker whether above or under ground were such as we should have difficulty in believing were not the details set out for us in reliable contemporary records and Parliamentary or other official reports. To cope with the new demand for goods, factories were hastily erected without any regard to the most elementary principles of sanitation, and even old barns, cart-houses, and out-buildings of all descriptions were crisscrossed up somehow and used as loom-shops. Men (and women, who began to be employed in large numbers) were worked unduly long hours and to the utmost limits of physical endurance. When the wages of the men fell to starvation point they consented to see their women entering the factories. The most horrifying feature of the industrial life of this period was the treatment of children. Many manufacturers, when they wanted even cheaper labour than was then available to them, obtained pauper children from the workhouses on the pretext of apprenticing them to the new employments which were springing up in such plenty. By an added refinement of cruelty it was sometimes arranged (in order that the responsibility for imbeciles should be passed on a stage further) that the mill-owner should take one mentally deficient child to twenty presumably normal ones. Though nominally apprenticed, these luckless infants were subjected to a veritable slavery; they were insufficiently clad, fed upon the cheapest food, and often employed sixteen hours out of the twenty-four. They worked day and night in relays, sleeping in filthy beds which were never allowed to cool, for one batch succeeded another without interval, and often without discrimination of sex. The majority did not commence work till nine years of age, but cases were known of children beginning at five. The few who after this brutal regimen had sufficient spirit left to wish to run away, or who were suspected of such rebellious inclinations, had irons riveted to their ankles and were compelled to work and sleep in them. Instances are recorded of women and girls being subjected to similar treatment. An official report dating from 1833, when conditions had slightly improved, thus summarises some of the grosser evils

1815
to
1832

Condi-
tions in
mines
and fac-
tories

1815 which the new methods of production, desirable in themselves,
to though grossly exploited for private profit, brought in their train:
1832 "We hear of children and young people in factories overworked
and beaten as if they were slaves; of diseases and distortions
only found in the manufacturing districts; of filthy, wretched
homes where people huddle together like beasts; we hear of girls
and women working underground in the dark recesses of the coal-
mines, dragging loads of coal in cars in places where no horses
could go, and harnessed and crawling along the subterranean
pathways like beasts of burden. Everywhere we find cruelty and
oppression, and in many cases the workmen were but slaves,
bound to fulfil their master's commands under fear of dismissal
and starvation." These evils were aggravated at the close of the
war by a falling off in the hitherto abnormal demand for manu-
factured goods, the colossal debt arising out of a protracted war,
and, to crown all, a falling revenue. It is small wonder that
political and social discontent became sharply vocal. To meet the
agricultural dislocation and to calm the fears of the landed interest
who dreaded foreign competition in food products, the first of
1815 a series of Corn Laws was passed in 1815, which forbade the
importation of foreign wheat until the home price had reached
80s. per quarter, of rye and pulse till the home price was 53s.,
of barley and oats till the price in the native market was 40s. and
20s. respectively. Meantime Cobbett and others strove to add fuel
to the flames of unrest which had burst out not only in the agri-
cultural but also in the manufacturing counties. In May, 1816,
riots broke out in Norfolk, Suffolk, Huntingdon, and Cambridge-
shire, and houses, barns, and ricks were set on fire by labourers who
demanded more employment and better wages. Similarly the
colliers of the Tyne-side, the ironworkers of Monmouthshire and
Staffordshire, the juteworkers of Dundee, and the clothworkers
of Wiltshire were also aflame with the spirit of revolt. Cobbett's
"Political Register," the price of which he had reduced in August
from 1s. 0½d. to 2d., was said by the end of the year to have reached
a circulation, enormous for that time, of 50,000 copies per week
and exercised a most potent influence among manual workers.
He denounced violence and rioting and urged his readers to con-
centrate upon the demand for political reforms. On November 15,
1816, an abortive meeting of workmen in the Spa Fields, Ber-
mondsey, to call attention to the miseries of the London working
classes, was followed a week afterwards by a less violent and more
authoritative protest in the shape of a formal address to the Prince
Regent by the Corporation of London, who declared that "the
distress and misery which for so many years has been progressively
accumulating, has at length become insupportable; that the
commercial, the manufacturing, and the agricultural interests
are equally sinking under its irresistible pressure, and it has
become impossible to find employment for a large mass of the
population." The causes of the evil were said by this august body

be "rash and ruinous wars, unjustly commenced and pertinaciously persisted in," and "the corrupt and inadequate state of the presentation of the people in Parliament," and the remedies, make "every practicable reduction in the public expenditure and restore to the people their just share and weight in the legislature."

1815
to
1832

The reports of secret committees, appointed in both Houses

Parliament to investigate the causes of the wide-spread agitation (as evinced by the rise of large numbers of political societies and the dissemination of the literature of a propaganda which demanded, for instance, universal suffrage and annual elections), used the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act for four months and the passing of further legislation to prevent seditious meetings. Further agitation in the North and the Midlands led to what was called the "March of the Blanketeers," because some thousands

workmen who took part in it, and who set out to march to London, each carried provisions and a blanket so as to be able to camp by the way. In June of the same year another abortive rising took place in the Midlands under the leadership of a man named Brandreth, a pauper in receipt of parish relief, who succeeded in inducing a band of about 500 men to march on Nottingham. The attempt was instantly foiled by the yeomanry, the surrectionists were scattered, and Brandreth with two other leaders was arrested and subsequently executed. For a time the agitation slackened and at the General Election of 1818, which was hotly contested, the majority remained with the Tories, though the Whigs gained about 30 votes. In the new House of Commons Sir Francis Burdett's motion urging reform of Parliament was defeated by 153 to 58. In various parts of the country huge meetings to agitate for reform were held at Glasgow, Leeds, Stockport, and elsewhere. The disaffected workers and their sympathisers of Lancashire and Cheshire planned a great demonstration to be held at St. Peter's Field, Manchester. On the appointed day the demonstrators to the number of at least 60,000 marched to the place of meeting bearing the mottoes "Universal Suffrage," "Annual Parliaments," "Vote by Ballot," "No Corn Laws," and similar catchwords. As soon as the meeting began, the yeomanry, by order of the Manchester magistrates, charged with drawn swords to the crowd with the object of arresting Orator Hunt, the chairman, and his supporters on the platform. In the *mêlée* which followed several people were trampled or sabred to death and some hundreds were injured. Hunt, Bamford, and others were arrested, and Hunt sentenced to imprisonment for two years and six months, Bamford and two others for twelve months. Although the Regent and the Government emphatically approved the conduct of the magistrates, meetings to express sympathy with the demonstrators were held at Liverpool, Norwich, Westminster, Nottingham, Bristol, and York. Perhaps the most weighty protest came from the Common Council of London, which by 71

1817

1818

1819
Peterloo

1815
to
1832

votes to 45 affirmed "the undoubted right of Englishmen to assemble together for the purpose of deliberating upon public grievances," and expressed the strongest disapproval of the action of the Manchester authorities. An interesting by-product of Peterloo was Shelley's "Masque of Anarchy," with its stirring refrain:

" Rise like Hons after slumber
In unvanquishable number.
Shake your chains to earth, like dew,
Which in sleep have fallen on you:
Ye are many, they are few,"

which the poet, at the time absent in Italy, was moved to write when reports of the meeting and the conflict with the yeomanry reached him.

Notwithstanding the numerous expressions of sympathy with the promoters of the Manchester meeting, the Ministry, which summoned Parliament on November 23 to discuss the situation, determined not to give way to popular feeling and forced through, in spite of strong opposition from Lord Grey and other Whigs, the series of measures known as the "Six Acts." The objects of these were: (1) to accelerate "the administration of justice in cases of misdemeanour," and to alter the procedure in such cases; (2) "to prevent the training of persons in the use of arms and the practice of military evolutions"; (3) to prevent and punish "blasphemous and seditious libels" (a second conviction for libel was to be punished with transportation); (4) "to authorise Justices of the Peace in certain disturbed counties to seize and detain arms"; (5) "to subject certain publications to the duties of stamps upon newspapers, and to make other regulations for restraining the abuses arising from the publication of blasphemous and seditious libels"; and (6) to prevent more effectually "seditious meetings and assemblies."

George
V.
1820
to
1830

The long reign of George III. came to an end in 1820, to be succeeded by that of one who was not only not liked but not even respected by his subjects. Princess Caroline of Brunswick had been married to the Regent in 1795, but had been separated from him by mutual consent after a very brief and unhappy married life, and had withdrawn to the Continent, where it was said that she led an irregular life. She returned to England in 1820 to claim the rights and dignities of a Queen. George IV. refused to acknowledge her, and Lord Liverpool, the Prime Minister, introduced a "Bill of Pains and Penalties" to deprive her of her title and to dissolve the marriage. The Queen posed as an injured woman and had the vehement support outside Parliament of people of all ranks, especially the middle and labouring classes, and even the Army. Whigs and Radicals, influenced as much by a desire to snatch a party advantage as by any more worthy motive, joined in championing the cause of the Queen. The bill was dropped, though it passed by a small majority, but the Queen died in 1821. The mutual support of the Whigs and

oals in the cause of the Queen persisted after her death and them associated in later efforts for political reform. In one case, Lord John Russell in 1821 succeeded in carrying his bill of disfranchisement of the corrupt borough of Grampound and transference of its seats to the County of York.

The year 1822 was marked by the return of Canning to the Foreign Office in the room of Castlereagh. In many ways he carried on by his predecessor, and especially two by which his own policy is best known and which coloured, if they did not dominate, British foreign policy for generations afterwards: (1) the recognition of national independence, including the claims of new nations which had won their freedom; (2) non-interference in the internal policy of foreign states. He broke away from "the Holy Alliance," which in its inception was an attempt to Christianise national politics. In the words of the scheme drafted by him in September, 1815, the rulers of Russia, Austria, and Prussia pledged themselves "agreeably to the words of Holy Scripture which commands all men to love as brothers, to remain united in the bonds of true and indissoluble brotherly love; always to aid one another; to govern their subjects as parents; to maintain religion, peace, and justice. They consider themselves but as members of one and the same Christian family commissioned by Providence to govern the branches of one family. They call on all powers who acknowledge similar principles to join this Alliance." This lofty ideal unfortunately does not appear to have been translated into practice. Canning seems to have considered it impracticable at the time, if not an insincere pretence.

The matter of fact in practice it degenerated into a policy of containing absolutism and reaction in place and repressing movements in the direction of liberalism or revolution. In home affairs, Huskisson's acceptance of the Presidency of the Board of Trade inaugurated a series of fiscal and commercial reforms based on the belief that "national prosperity would be most usually promoted by an unrestrained competition not only between the capital and the industry of different classes in the same country, but also by extending that competition as much as possible to all other countries." Import duties were reduced, or at least made more uniform. Bounties on exports were abolished. The rigidity of the Navigation Laws was relaxed and by the Reciprocity Act power was given to the King in Council to conclude reciprocity treaties with our own colonies or with other countries. A rough summary of the results would estimate the reduction of taxes at 30 per cent. *ad valorem* on manufactured goods and at 10 per cent. on raw materials. Similarly restrictions on labour were removed, and by the Combination Act of 1824, which was carried, in the words of Francis Place, who with Hume skilfully engineered its progress through Parliament, "almost without the notice of members within or newspapers without,"

1815
to
1832

1822
Canning's
Foreign
Policy

1823
Huskisson's
Policy

1825

1824

1815 trade unions, which at that time were unlawful associations, were
 1832 made legal. Trade societies seemed to rise out of the ground
 in all directions immediately after the passage of the Act and
 many strikes occurred not unaccompanied by violence. A Sheffield
 newspaper called attention to the fact that "it is no longer a
 particular class of journeymen at some single point that have
 been reduced to commence a strike for an advance of wages, but
 almost the whole body of the mechanics in the kingdom are
 combined in the general resolution to impose terms on their
 employers." Another newspaper in the same town warned the
 local operatives that if they persisted in their demand for double
 their former wages for a week of only three days, the whole industry
 of the town would be ruined.¹ The result of these outbursts was the
 1825 passing in 1825 of a further Combination Act which reaffirmed the
 common law of conspiracy and conceded a limited right of com-
 bination, but, a most important fact in the history of the relations
 between capital and labour, for the first time explicitly established
 the right of "collective bargaining," usually regarded with dis-
 favour by employers for fifty years to come, but later accepted
 by many, if not most, disinterested observers of its working as not
 only in the long run beneficial to employers as well as workmen,
 but also on the whole socially beneficent. One of the most curious
 examples of political prophecy was the statement of Place, to the
 extraordinarily alert intelligence of whom more than any one
 else the passing of these acts was due, that by the grant to work-
 men of liberty to combine combinations would "soon cease to
 exist!"

Ministry of the Duke of Wellington
 1828 to 1830
 Catholic Emancipation
 The two years during which the Duke of Wellington was Prime
 Minister were marked by two important measures, the wisdom
 of which would now not be disputed, though they were hotly con-
 tested at the time. The Test and Corporation Acts, which com-
 pelled every holder of a public office, whether civil or military, to
 take the Sacrament according to the rites of the Church of England,
 were repealed and for the sacramental Test was substituted a
 simple declaration that the holder of an office would do nothing
 "to injure or subvert the Protestant Established Church." The
 Catholic Emancipation Act marked the concluding and decisive
 battle in the long struggle for the political rights of Catholics.
 Pitt had meant to grant complete emancipation side by side with
 the Act of Union; Peel, Fox, Grattan, Plunket, Canning had
 striven for the principle, but it was the foundation of the Catholic
 Association by Daniel O'Connell in 1823 and his subsequent
 triumphant election in 1828 for the County of Clare against Fitz-
 gerald which made the grant of this long-withheld measure inevit-
 able. It contained various provisions designed as the framers of
 the Bill unwisely supposed to prevent the spread of Catholicism,
 but it permitted Roman Catholics to become eligible for all civil,
 military, Parliamentary, and municipal offices save those of Regent,

¹ Webb, "Trade Unionism," pp. 93, 94.

Lieutenant of Ireland, Lord Chancellor of England or Ireland, very few others.

1815
to
1832

fortunately, this concession to justice and toleration was nullified by a second Act in the same year, conceived in a shortsighted spirit of spleen and desire for revenge. The cause of Catholic Emancipation had been carried to victory by the votes of 40s. freeholders, but by the new Act the qualification for a vote in an Irish county was fixed at £10 and the electorate at a time reduced from 200,000 to 26,000.

1830 George IV. died unregretted on June 26 and on November 3 the Ministry of Wellington and Peel resigned. Wellington, notwithstanding the growing demand for political reform, declined to do anything to do with the question. Peel, if he was at variance with the Whigs on the subject of changes in Parliamentary representation, will be remembered for many salutary changes during his tenure of the Home Office (1822-27, 1828-30). He reformed the criminal code (especially by drastically reducing the number of offences for which capital punishment could be inflicted) and criminal procedure; swept away some of the grosser anomalies of the Marriage Laws; systematised the constitution and functions of juries; improved the condition of the gaols; and established in London a new police force.

William
IV.
1830
to
1837

The question of the moment was parliamentary reform. The demands for movements for popular government in France and in America had added impetus to the efforts of British Whigs and Radicals, and demands became more insistent. In England there were serious outbreaks of disaffection among labourers in Kent, Surrey, Dorsetshire, Gloucestershire, Hampshire, Wiltshire, and Dorsetshire, who demanded higher wages, and in many cases destroyed stacks, ricks, and barns, and broke up threshing machines. Considerable damage was done by the rioters to property, but not to persons. The demands of the labourers that their wages, which usually stood at 9s. or 10s. a week and in extreme cases at not more than 6s., should be raised to 2s. 6d. a day met with a considerable amount of sympathy from other classes. The correspondent of the "Times" (November 17) describing the outbreak in Sussex, where the revolt was more widely spread, organised, and more successful than in any other part of the country, gives a description of the methods of the labourers, which might equally have been applied to the risings in other parts of the country. "Divested of its objectionable character, as a dangerous precedent, the conduct of the peasantry has been admirable. There is no ground for concluding that there has been an extensive concert amongst them. Each parish, generally speaking, has risen *per se*; in many places their proceedings have been managed with astonishing coolness and regularity; there has been little of the ordinary effervescence displayed on similar occasions: a deputation of two or more of the latter produce a statement, well drawn up, which the farmers are required

1830

"The
Last La-
bourers'
Revolt."

1815
to
1832

to sign; the spokesman, sometimes a Dissenting or Methodist teacher, fulfils his office with great propriety and temper. Where disorder has occurred, it has arisen from dislike to some obnoxious clergyman, or tithe man, or assistant overseer, who has been trundled out of the parish in a wheel-barrow, or drawn in triumph in a load of ballast by a dozen old women. The farmers universally agreed to the demands they made: that is, they were not mad enough to refuse requests which they could not demonstrate to be unreasonable in themselves, and which were urged by three hundred or four hundred men after a barn or two had been fired, and each farmer had an incendiary letter addressed to him in his pocket."¹ Nevertheless, special Commissions at Winchester, Salisbury, Dorchester, Reading, Aylesbury, appointed to try the rioters for offences which in most cases amounted to nothing more serious than "seditious assembly," and at worst to offences against property which involved no loss of life, condemned about 450 men, some to death, many to transportation for life, and the remainder to long terms of imprisonment.

The
need for
Parlia-
mentary
Reform

Had the agitation for political reform, however, been merely the outburst of disaffected labourers it would have been doomed to failure at that time. But it had long been evident that a system which (in England and Wales) had undergone no change since 1688 was inadequate for the needs of an age which had entered upon an agrarian and an industrial revolution. In the "unreformed House of Commons" the counties were represented by two members each, the boroughs returned to Parliament men elected on a chaotic and indefensible variety of franchise and an equally chaotic and indefensible distribution of seats. Of 203 parliamentary boroughs with two members each there were 62 where only the hereditary "freemen" could vote; in 59 (the so-called "scot and lot") the electors were those who paid church and poor rates or "potwallopers" (a name applied to another variety of boroughs), i.e., persons who (1) had a hearth of their own where they could boil a pot and (2) were not in receipt of poor relief; 39 where only the owners or occupiers of certain houses known as "ancient tenements" had the right of franchise. Some of these places, like Old Sarum or Bramber, were barely discoverable on the map, while large and growing centres of industry like Manchester, Birmingham, and Leeds had no independent representation at all. Worse still, as Erskine May pointed out, not more than a third of the members of the House of Commons had entered it as "the free choice even of the limited bodies of electors then entrusted with the franchise." The demand for reform now reached a point where it could no longer be delayed or denied, as the results of the labours, extending over a generation, of many hands. To this demand contributed the reasoned politics of Bentham, Hume, and the two Mills; the fiery invective and terse vigour of Cobbett; the restless energy and astute manipulation of Francis

¹ Quoted in Hammond's "Village Labourer," pp. 247, 248.

; the determination of the commercial classes in general to a share of political power. Earl Grey's Whig Ministry of 1831 to 1832 was sure of powerful backing when, as its first legislative act, it set about drafting proposals for reform. The Bill presented to Parliament disfranchised 60 boroughs, and deprived 47 others of a member each, while it gave members to counties or large towns hitherto unrepresented. The voting qualification was also radically altered and simplified. In the counties, to the old 40s. freeholders were added copyholders and £50 tenants. In the boroughs the old freeholders retained the right of suffrage and to the number were added householders with a £10 property qualification. As the Bill passed the second reading by a majority of 101, the Ministry appealed to the country and received the splendid mandate of a majority of over 100. The Bill, substantially unaltered, was immediately re-introduced, and though it failed at its second reading by a majority of 136 was thrown out by the House of Lords by a majority of 41. This action was immediately followed by demonstrations of protest, sometimes accompanied with violence. At Birmingham a meeting, said to have been attended by 150,000 persons, was held and resolutions were passed affirming that no taxes should be paid until the Bill was passed. At Nottingham the Castle was burnt down, at Bristol the House of Commons and Bishop's Palace were set on fire. When the House of Commons met again in December a third Reform Bill passed its second reading by a majority of 182, but in the following month the House of Lords carried an important amendment against a majority of 35. The Cabinet thereupon advised the King to create as many peers as would ensure the passing of the Bill substantially unaltered, but as he was opposed to this step, the Ministry offered and he accepted their resignation. After a period of ten days, during which the King appealed to Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Brougham, and finally to the Duke of Wellington to form a Ministry, and in various places throughout the country preparation was made for armed rebellion, the King, on the advice of the Duke of Wellington, recalled Earl Grey, to whom he granted permission to create such a number of Peers as will be sufficient to ensure the passing of the Reform Bill, first calling up Peers' eldest sons." Further opposition to the Bill fruitless. In its final form its main clauses provided that 56 boroughs with two members should be disfranchised; 30 should lose one member each. 143 seats thus to be disposed of, to keep the total number of seats at 65 were given to English and Welsh counties; 22 English counties received two members each, 21 one member each; 8 were given to Scotland and 5 to Ireland. The voting qualification in the counties was assigned to the old 40s. freeholders, copyholders, long-lease holders, and tenants at will paying rent of not less than £50 a year; in the boroughs to resident householders in corporate towns and to all £10 householders. The main significance of the Act was that for the first time it

1831

to

1832

—

1831

Earl
Grey's
Ministry

1832

1832
to
1870

brought into being a representative House. It transferred the political centre of gravity from the old landed aristocracy to the middle and commercial classes and gave Protestant Dissenters real political influence. It satisfied neither the philosophic Radicals, who wished for something more systematic and logical, nor the working classes, who saw few of their number added to the electorate by it, but it left the door open for further change and it swept away many intolerable abuses.

CHAPTER II

FROM THE REFORM BILL TO THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1870

1832-1870

[*Authorities.*—The “Annual Register,” the “Parliamentary Debates,” and the files of the “Times” must be constantly studied. Good detailed histories are Walpole’s “History”; Herbert Paul’s “Modern England”; the “Cambridge Modern History” (vol. xi); Marriott’s “England since Waterloo”; and Justin MacCarthy’s “Modern England from the Reform Bill to 1898”; Low and Sandar’s “Political History of England (1837-1901)”; Rose’s “Development of the European Nations.” Dicoy’s “Law and Public Opinion” and Dickinson’s “Development of Parliament in the Nineteenth Century” are most informing and instructive. Special aspects of the period are treated in Cunningham’s “Growth of English Industry and Commerce”; the Reports of the Factory Commissions of 1833 and 1842 and of the Poor Law Commission of 1834; Engel’s “The Condition of the Working Classes in England in 1844”; Hutchins’ “The Health Agitation (1834-1848)”; B. Webb’s “The Co-operative Movement.” Literature has supplied pictures of the national life which are also of historical value. Disraeli’s novels; Mrs. Gaskell’s “Mary Barton”; Kingsley’s “Yeast” and “Alton Locke”; Carlyle’s “Chartism,” “Past and Present,” and “Sartor Resartus” are full not merely of interesting but instructive material. The biographical literature dealing with this period is of the highest importance. Queen Victoria’s “Letters” (edited by Lord Esher and A. C. Benson); Greville’s “Journals”; Croker’s “Correspondence and Diaries” (edited Jennings); the “Memorials of Roundell Palmer, Earl of Selborne”; the biographies of Palmerston (Lord Dalling and E. Ashley), Granville (Lord Fitzgerald), Lord George Bentinck (Disraeli), Lord Shaftesbury (E. Hodder), Macaulay (Sir G. Trevelyan), Disraeli (W. Sichel; Monypenny), Gladstone (Morley), Cobden (Morley), John Bright (Trevelyan), Robert Owen (Podmore), and Samuel Smiles’ “Lives of the Engineers” give most vivid and also historically valuable accounts of the surging life of the time. Special information about Ireland may be found in the Report of the Devon Commission (1845); Bryce’s “Two Centuries of Irish History”; O’Connor Morris’ “Ireland from 1798 to 1898”; O’Brien’s “Fifty Years of Concession in Ireland”; R. T. Ball’s “The Reformed Church in Ireland”; and Brady’s “The English State Church in Ireland.” On the subject of India Sir A. Lyall’s “British Dominion in India”; Earl Roberts’ “Forty-one Years in India”; and Sir J. Outram’s “History of the Mutiny” may be consulted; while for Canada Lord Durham’s Report (edited Lucas) and Egerton and Grant’s “Evolution of Canadian Self-Government” are for the ordinary reader perhaps the most useful. Graham Balfour’s “Educational Systems of Great Britain and Ireland” is quite the best compendious account of public education in the British Islands.]

The Re-
formed
Parlia-
ment

THE reformed Parliament immediately set about the task of making up arrears in legislation. Up to 1833 the work of secular education for the children of the poor in England and Wales fell mainly upon two voluntary societies, the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the

erform Bill to Education Act, 1870 805

ished Church and the British and Foreign School Society, was mainly supported by Nonconformists. On August 17, the House of Commons voted a sum of £20,000 "for purposes of education," and this amount was handed over to the Treasury for the erection of schoolhouses in Great Britain subject to the condition that half the cost should be met by voluntary contributions. Hume voted against the grant on the ground that no moneys were available for the purpose, while Cobbett maintained that it was an attempt "to force education on the country—on the basis of a Doctrinaire plan," the sole result of which would be to increase the number of schoolmasters and mistresses, that is, of idlers." To the same year belongs also Lord Althorp's Factory Act, which was the culmination of the "Ten Hours" Bill, in which the most prominent figures were Richard B. Fox, Michael Sadler, and Lord Shaftesbury among Tories, and John Lubbock, Hindley, and Brotherton among Liberals and Radicals. In 1833 Sadler had written a series of letters to the "Leeds Mercury" and the "Leeds Intelligencer," entitled "Slavery in Yorkshire," in which he denounced the factory system, and demanded a ten-hour day for all workers under twenty-one years of age. These demands were the beginning of a vigorous demand, which gathered momentum as it went, and finally was embodied in the Act mentioned above, which was carried through under the Parliamentary leadership of Lord Shaftesbury. The new law prohibited work between 4.30 a.m. and 5.30 a.m. to all under 18 employed "in or about any woollen, worsted, hemp, flax, tow, linen, or silk mill"; and prohibited more than 12 hours a day or 69 a week for persons under 18 to do all work by children under nine years of age except in silk mills. The most important provision of the Act was the appointment of paid inspectors, empowered to enter at will any factories or mills, to examine the children, or to subpoena witnesses, to enforce binding rules and regulations, and to enforce school attendance. In 1833 Powell Buxton, Clarkson, Wilberforce, and Zachary Taylor reaped the fruits of the painful efforts of many years. The government passed an Act for the "abolition of slavery throughout the British Colonies." Slavery, it was decided, should have an end on August 1, 1834, but all children under six years of age were to be set free at once and all unborn children were to be born free. The planters were to receive a compensation of £20,000. If the high hopes of the supporters of the movement culminated in the passing of this Act were not completely fulfilled, at least it was a stroke of disinterested self-sacrifice on the part of a proud memory of the British race. Freedom received a further extension in 1833, when Quakers, Moravians, and Separatists were allowed to enter the House of Commons and to substitute affirmation for an oath. The growth of a new feeling of refinement was shown in the passing of an Act (carried in 1833 and two years afterwards extended to the whole country) which made it illegal "to drive any ox or cattle, or to bait any bull, bear, badger,

1832
to
1870

1833
Begin
nings of
public
educa-
tion

Factory
Legisla-
tion

Emanci-
pation of
the
Slaves

1832 or other animal, or to fight cocks, within 5 miles of Temple
to Bar.”

1870 — 1834 is a landmark in the social history of England in its way
perhaps as important as 1832. In that year the Commission of
inquiry appointed by Lord Grey's Government in 1832 reported
and the Poor Law Amendment Act was passed. The Report,
which in its main features was the work of the laborious and penetrating intellect of Edwin Chadwick, one of the Commissioners, described conditions of demoralisation, filth, and maladministration which, outside an official document, would have been almost incredible. The expenditure on poor relief, which in 1802 stood at £4,000,000, had risen in 1818 to £7,870,000 or an average of 13s. 8d. per head of population. The vicious Speenhamland system of allowances to supplement wages had proved a direct stimulus to underpayment and sweating on the one hand, to sluggishness and thriftlessness on the other. Poor relief (until 1834) was a matter of local administration, carried on by the Justices of the Peace, without direction or interference from the centre. The new Act, which followed close upon the publication of the Report of the Commission and adopted its main recommendations, was carried almost unanimously in both Houses of Parliament. It established central control and put administration in the hands of a body of three Poor Law Commissioners. It made the union, instead of the parish, the unit of local administration. It provided that all owners and occupiers of rateable property should be represented (by votes for the Boards of Guardians) and that representation should be in proportion to taxable capacity. The general principle of relief was that "the situation of the person receiving relief should not on the whole be made really or apparently so eligible as the situation of the independent labourer of the lowest class," or, as it was expressed in a grimmer and slightly different form by the Assistant Commissioner in his address to the labouring classes of the county of Kent, "the hanger-on ought not to be raised higher than him on whom he hangs." Perhaps this principle was an echo of Bentham who wrote in 1831, "Maintenance at the expense of others should not be made more desirable than self-maintenance." The first Board to which Chadwick was appointed as secretary met with vigorous opposition. Disraeli called Chadwick "this monster in human shape" and Cobbett was no less outspoken, while the "Times" thundered against "the three Pashas of Somerset House or the Pinch-Pauper Triumvirate." Nevertheless, the Act stemmed the rising tide of demoralisation and will be remembered for its introduction of the principle of centralisation (useful at the time and circumstances), for the "less-eligibility" standard, and for the appointment of permanent paid officials presumably trained for the special work of relief.

The working classes, however, were learning the lesson of self-help and beginning to combine in large and powerful associations, and even to federate these in larger combinations. In the year

attempts were made to form a "General Union of all Trades," "General Union of the Productive Classes," and in 1834 a "National Consolidated Trades Union." "Within a few the Union appears to have been joined by at least half a members, including tens of thousands of farm labourers men. The extension of new lodges in previously unorganised trades and districts was enormous. Numerous missionary lodges, duly equipped with all the paraphernalia required for mystic initiation rites, perambulated the country; and a mania for Trade Unionism set in. In December, 1833, we find that 'scarcely a branch of trade exists in the West of England that is not now in a state of union.' The 'Times' reports two delegates who went to Hull enrolled in one evening a hundred men of various trades. At Exeter the two delegates were seized by the police, and found to be furnished with 'two wooden cutlasses, two masks, and two white garments or a large figure of Death with the dart and hourglass, a Bible and Testament.' Shop assistants on the one hand, and journey-men, chimney-sweeps on the other, were swept into the vortex. Cabinet-makers of Belfast insisted on joining 'the Trades Union or Friendly Society, which had for its object the unity of cabinet-makers in the three kingdoms.' We hear of 'Ploughing Unions' as far off as Perthshire, and of a 'Shearman's Union' at Dundee. And the then rural character of the metropolitan suburbs is quaintly brought home to us by the announcement of a union of the 'agricultural and other labourers' of Wotton, Walham Green, Fulham, and Hammersmith. Nor were the women neglected. 'The Grand Lodge of Operative Tailors' vies in activity with the miscellaneous 'Grand Lodge of the Women of Great Britain and Ireland,' and the 'Society of Female Tailors' asks indignantly whether the 'Tailors' Union' is really going to prohibit women from making waistcoats. Whether the Grand National Consolidated Trades Union is responsible for the Lodges of 'Female Gardeners' and 'Saint Virgins,' who afterwards distinguished themselves in a strenuous demand for an eight-hours' day at Oldham, is not

1832
to
1870

Parliament of 1835 was responsible for an important measure which laid the foundation for progress in the development of the government of which had more and more passed into the hands of corrupt oligarchies, who either elected themselves or were elected by persons or interests whose behests they had to follow. The Report of a Commission of Inquiry appointed in 1833 exposed a shocking condition of bribery, misappropriation, and mismanagement with a hopeless absence of any attempt on the part of the corporations to apply themselves to local government, their proper task. The Commissioners reported that "there prevailed among the great majority of the incorporated towns a

Municipal Corporation Act

¹ Webb, "Trade Unionism," pp. 120-122.

1832 general, and in our opinion a just, dissatisfaction with their
to municipal institutions; a distrust of the self-elected municipal
1870 councils, whose powers are subject to no popular control, and
whose acts and proceedings, being secret, are unchecked by the
influence of public opinion; a distrust of the municipal magis-
tracy; a discontent under the burthens of local taxation, while
revenues which ought to be applied to the public advantage
are sometimes wastefully bestowed upon individuals, sometimes
squandered for objects injurious to the character and morals of the
people . . . the existing municipal corporations neither possess
nor deserve the confidence or respect" of His Majesty's subjects,
and "a thorough reform must be effected before they become
useful and efficient instruments of local government." The new
Act vested the government in councillors, elected by the burgesses,
who in their turn elected mayor and aldermen and with them
appointed and had control of all municipal servants. Upon this
body of elected persons were devolved the usual duties of local
administration and the power to raise and expend funds for public
purposes, under the safeguard of an independent audit. Another
clause, which applied to the provinces and not to London, provided
that members should sit in groups of three or six for wards, into
which the boroughs were divided, and one-third of the members
for each ward should retire each year.

Victoria 1837 to 1901 With the death of William IV. in 1837 and the accession of
Queen Victoria the personal rule of the sovereign came to an end
and constitutional monarchy, in any real sense of the term, began.
The young Princess who succeeded to the throne had been carefully
trained in habits of order, industry, and considerateness for others
combined with independence. Her first Minister, Melbourne, in
whose advice she placed great reliance, guided her in the way that
led to constitutionalism. Disorder and the clamour for repeal in
Ireland, rebellion in Canada, the growing strength of the Chartist
and similar movements in England made the circumstances of her
accession difficult. In Canada the people of both the Upper and
Lower Provinces were dissatisfied with their Executives, which by
Pitt's Act of 1791 were separate, and were jealous of each other,
for the Upper Province was peopled mainly by British, the Lower
by French settlers. In Lower Canada the representative assembly
decided to refuse supplies, and the French party under the leader-
ship of Papineau raised the standard of rebellion and received
some support from the other province. The Home Government in
1838 decided to suspend temporarily the Constitution of Lower
Canada and to send out Lord Durham as High Commissioner,
with full powers to deal with the rebellion and to recast the constitu-
tion of both provinces. The Report which appeared under his
name in 1839 is an historic document, wherein were formulated
principles that were adopted in the following year in the case of
Canada and later in all the more important British colonies. It
recommended that as far as possible Canada should be governed

colonists themselves without interference from the Imperial Government and that all officers of the Canadian administration, the Governor and his secretary, must be responsible to the people of the two provinces. The Act of Union passed in 1840 Ontario and Quebec, and provided for a bi-cameral Parliament, a Legislative Council nominated by the crown, and an elected House of Representatives. Lord Durham's mission was marred by his edible tactlessness, but the Report which bears his name has laid the nation fundamental principles which have ever since been the foundation, and indeed explain the success, of colonial policy.

1832
to
1870

Union of
Ontario
and
Quebec

Dissatisfaction of the working classes of England with the results of the Reform Act of 1832 was the prime cause of the movement known as Chartism, led by Lovett of the London Working Men's Association, who believed in constitutional reform, and by Feargus O'Connor, who, sometimes at least, advocated a policy of violence. Lovett, at the suggestion of Francis Taylor, drafted, with the authority of the London Working Men's Association, a programme of reforms upon which the workpeople were asked to concentrate as an irreducible minimum, to be carried forthwith and to be used as a lever for remedying industrial evils such as low wages and unsatisfactory conditions of labour.

This programme, upon which O'Connell bestowed the name of Charter, whence the movement came to be known as Chartism, had six points: annual parliaments, manhood suffrage, ballot, abolition of the property qualification for members of Parliament, payment of members, equal electoral districts. The programme, which at the time caused much alarm in the aristocracy, was anything but new. But now for the first time it seemed to be breathed into it and it spread like wildfire. Immediately the physical force wing of the movement became dominant, and the House of Commons refused even to consider a petition, embodying five of the points contained in it, and signed by nearly two million names.

Chartism

In the year 1839, however, brought with it two measures, the effect of which upon the great mass of the people, if not immediately visible, were immense in their ultimate results. A new commission of the Privy Council was appointed to supervise elementary education, the grant in aid was raised from £20,000 to £30,000, and new officers were appointed. Rowland Hill, who had convinced himself that the high charges for the delivery of letters were unjustifiable from the merely commercial point of view, worked out a comprehensive scheme in which he proposed that letters should be sent out more frequently and more speedily and that there should be a uniform charge of one penny the half-ounce within the Kingdom. Though the Post Office authorities at first hesitated, the commercial classes strongly supported the scheme, the government adopted and placed on the statute book. The results are too obvious to require comment.

1839

Penny
Postage

1832
to
1870
—

Applica-
tion of
Steam
to In-
dustry
and
Trans-
port

Other influences at this time were introducing fundamental changes in the lives of the people. The application of steam power to locomotion, due to George Stephenson, the self-educated mechanic, who at eighteen years of age had not learnt to read and whose belief in the potentialities of steam made staid and unrecaptive people think he was beside himself, was now beginning to be firmly established. The Stockton and Darlington Railway, which on the advice of its engineer, George Stephenson, had applied for parliamentary powers to use steam, was opened on September 27, 1825. Yet the "Annual Register" for that year, such was the blindness of the official mind, did not even mention it.

The event had at the time a merely local importance, and though some London newspapers published brief accounts of it a week after the opening took place, neither those who believed in the new invention nor the good people who supposed that a speed of a couple of dozen miles an hour was an impious interference with the designs of Providence realised that for England something had occurred more noteworthy than the passing of the Reform Act, and for both the New World and the Old, something more important than the battle of Waterloo. No change introduced into England in the nineteenth century was received with such doubts and fears, none was so immediately and consistently a gain to the whole population. The application of steam to industry made transport more reliable, more punctual, and more frequent; stimulated industry and invention in every department; created, by the curious paradox which makes labour-saving devices bring in their train an increased demand for labour, an immensely larger number of avenues of employment; enabled factories and workshops to be established over a wider area of country, and increased the mobility of labour; more profoundly important still, by cheapening and speeding up the means of communication, it facilitated human intercourse not only from town to town, but from country to country. The changes brought about by the railway in England, where distances were short, were amazing, but not so amazing as in the case of the United States, where railways not only made a highway between the East and the Middle West, but opened up the Far West. Nowadays the mention of a Cape to Cairo railway or a Trans-Siberian line from the Far East to Petrograd no longer provokes wonder. The later effects of the application of steam to transit by land or sea have been the possibility of rapid transference not only of goods, raw or manufactured, but of perishable food products over long distances; the specialisation of industry and the division of labour; the introduction of large scale industry, followed by the rise of the joint-stock company system and the development of banking and credit; and the possibility of linking up and developing the several parts of a world-wide empire.¹

¹ The reader will see at a glance the importance of this point by consulting the Map of the World facing p. 838.

annual expenditure on railways, which until 1844 had not more than £5,000,000, rose to £185,000,000 in 1844-6. In 1844 the Railway Regulation Act was passed, which established the Board of Trade in the interests of public safety to inspect railways before they were opened. The Cheap Trains Act of 1844 provided that every line must run a train each way at a speed of not less than 12 miles an hour and at a charge of not more than one penny a mile. An important clause of this Act, which, in its original intention, to relate, has been left sterile, though it might have been fruitful to the advantage of commerce, industry, agriculture, and the travelling public in general, laid down the principle that the profits of railways, the profits of which exceeded 10 per cent., might be taken out by the state at twenty-five years' purchase of "the divisible profits, estimated on the average of the three preceding years."

Develop- ment of Rail- ways

opening of a co-operative store by the Rochdale Pioneers was the seed-plot of movements destined to have profound effects not only on the labouring classes of England, but on the continent of Europe, where the ideas of British co-operators were adopted and in some instances applied with greater success. Co-operation was not a new idea in 1844, but from that date it was to be an effective force. The purposes of the society included besides the establishment of a store for the sale of produce "the building, purchasing, or erecting a number of houses, in which those members, desiring to assist each other in improving their domestic and social condition, may reside;" the manufacture of goods, or purchase or rent of land, in order to employ members who were out of work or under-paid; and further, "that as far as practicable this society shall proceed to arrange the powers of production, distribution, education, and government; or, in other words, to establish a self-supporting home colony of united workers, or assist other societies in establishing such colonies." The society, which began its career at the "Auld Weywur's Shop" in Church Street, had at its inception 28 members, with a duly elected secretary, a cashier (responsible for a turnover of £22,000 a week), and a treasurer, who had to administer an accumulated fund of £28. The original members were Chartists, Trade Unionists, or Owenite Socialists, but their aims were identical with those propounded nearly a generation earlier by Robert Owen.

removal of taxes by Peel's great Budget of 1842, though it produced some improvement, had not availed to produce any amelioration in the condition of the working classes. Peel declared that in 1842 "one person in every eleven was starving, and one person in every five hundred was committed to prison." In Ireland conditions were worse and were aggravated

1832
to
1870

1845
Failure
of Potato
Crop in
Ireland

by the failure in 1845 of the potato crop, the staple food of the Irish peasantry. Disraeli's picture¹ of the state of the country at that time was literally true. "It was said by the Royal Commission over which Lord Devon presided, that the Irish people were the worst housed, the worst fed, and the worst clothed of any in Europe. They live in mud cabins littered upon straw; their food consists of dry potatoes, of which they are often obliged to stint themselves to one spare meal. Sometimes a herring or a little milk may afford them a pleasing variety, but sometimes also they are driven to seaweed and to wild herbs. Dwelling in hovels and feeding upon roots, they are clothed in rags. Those were the ordinary circumstances of Ireland, and to such a state of affairs famine was now added with all its attendant horrors, pestilence and death. In the southern and western parts of the country the population was decimated; 10,000 persons at the meeting of Parliament had died in the Union of Skibbereen, which numbered 100,000 souls." It might be added that the total population of Ireland, which stood at 8,175,124 at the census of 1841, had in 1851 fallen to 6,552,385, and that the decrease in population, though not with such fatal rapidity, continued till the end of the century with undiminished and appalling regularity.

1846
Peel and
Free
Trade

The failure of the potato crop in Ireland convinced Peel that the only way to meet the need of the labouring classes not only in Ireland, but in Great Britain, for cheaper food was "the total and absolute repeal for ever of all duties on all articles of subsistence." In his speech on the Address to the Throne at the January Parliament of 1846 he declared that he had been converted to the principle of Free Trade, and on May 15 he carried the third reading of his Act for the Repeal of the Corn Law by a majority of 98 against the Protectionists led by Disraeli and Lord George Bentinck. In 1836 an Anti-Corn Law Association had been started in London by Grote, Molesworth, Joseph Hume, and Roebuck, and a similar society in Manchester in 1838, the parent of the Anti-Corn Law League, of which the moving spirit was Richard Cobden, powerfully assisted by Bright, W. J. Fox, and other brilliant lieutenants. It is true that the driving-power of this movement, whether in eloquence or organising capacity, was supplied in the main by cotton manufacturers who were fighting in a sense for their own interests, but it is no less true that they were fighting for the interests of the whole working population of the British islands. Moreover they were profoundly right in their main contentions that the manufacturer must have cheaper raw materials, the farmer cheaper seed, and the whole population cheaper means of subsistence. Even if their dream that unrestricted freedom of trade between nations would tend to produce friendly relations has hardly been justified by subsequent events, at least it was a noble dream, which brought no shame to the heads that conceived it.

¹ "Life of Lord George Bentinck."

the movement for the improvement of industrial conditions, especially in the direction of shortening excessive hours of work, made a perceptible advance by the passing of the Ten Hours Act (1847), introduced into the House of Commons by Mr. Estlin, though the credit for it must in the main be given to Lord Shaftesbury, the noble-hearted peer who in season and out of season, in face of prejudice and opposition even from those who might have been expected to assist him, gave himself with single-minded devotion to the cause of the poor and oppressed. The Act, which is valuable not so much for its immediate application as for the principle it gave Parliamentary sanction to a principle afterwards widely developed and extended, limited the hours of labour of men, women and children in textile factories to ten hours. It is curious to find that Bright, assuredly a sincere friend of the people, spoke of the Act as "one of the worst measures ever passed in the history of an Act of the legislature," and Cooke Taylor, another Radical, said of it, "a remedy (for industrial dislocation) has been proposed, which has no parallel in the annals of quackery." In the same year Lord John Russell proposed to defray the cost of the taxes one-third of the money required for elementary teaching. Bright, Roebuck, and other Radicals strongly opposed the measure on the ground that education was not a State concern. Roebuck, however, in one of his finest speeches, maintained that the policeman or the judge, but the schoolmaster, was the guardian of life and property, and the measure was triumphantly carried by a huge majority.

1832
to
1870
—
1847
The Ten
Hours
Act

Public sanitation may be said to have begun with the establishment of the "General Board of Health" in 1848, a body created as the outcome of the Report issued in 1845 by a Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Health of Towns and Populous Districts. The Report declared that, out of 50 towns studied, scarcely one had drainage that could be pronounced good; in seven it was indifferent, and in forty-two decidedly bad, especially in the poorer districts. The Board, which in several respects took as a model the Poor Law Board of 1834, was composed of Lord Shaftesbury, Lord Morpeth, Edwin Chadwick, and Dr. Southwood Smith, able, disinterested, and determined men, who cared nothing for the clamours of party politics. Chadwick had been sent to the Board with the avowed hope "that he would now keep quiet." But for the fulfilment of this hope he seems to have been even more energetic, determined, and deadly in his criticisms than he had been on the Poor Law Commission. Although the Board of Health lasted to an end in 1854 and was replaced by a new Board with a President sitting in the House, it was while it lasted a kind of living witness against filth and insanitation with their attendant of disease and aggravated poverty.

Elementary
Education

1848
Beginnings of
Public
Sanitation

The pathetic interest attaches to the Great Exhibition of 1851. It was planned and carried to a striking success by the Prince Consort. The promoters of the enterprise believed that it would not only

1851
The
Great
Exhibition

1832 benefit trade and industry, but "bring in the universal peace."
to
1870 The next 60 years were to show that not thus alone was the demon

Crimean
War
1854-6

of war to be exorcised. The high hopes which inspired the Great Exhibition were only too speedily to be frustrated by a series of wars, in the first of which, the Crimean, we were deeply involved.

The complex details of the campaign which began in 1854 and ended (superficially speaking) with the Peace of Paris in 1856, cannot here be set down, but it is well to recall the causes which brought about the war, and the terms to which the nations engaged in it agreed at the conclusion of peace. By a treaty, dating from 1740, France had obtained from Turkey the custody of the sacred places in and about Jerusalem, whither the pious of both Greek and Latin Churches made pilgrimage. For more than 100 years France had neglected her duty to care for these shrines, and members of the Greek Church had tended and kept them in repair. In May, 1850, Louis Napoleon, supported by Austria, Spain, and other Catholic countries, reasserted the treaty rights of France, and, after prolonged negotiation, the Porte in substance conceded his demand, whereupon Russia immediately entered an energetic protest. In March, 1853, the Czar Nicholas sent Prince Menschikoff on a special mission to Constantinople to demand full satisfaction about the holy places and an acknowledgment by the Sultan of the Czar's protectorate over all orthodox subjects in Turkish territory. In April Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, the British representative at Constantinople, persuaded the Porte to admit Russia's first claim but to refuse the second. On July 21 a Russian army occupied the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. In October the Sultan, on the suggestion of Lord Stratford, called upon Russia to evacuate the Principalities within fifteen days, and followed up the demand with a declaration of war on October 23. On November 30 the Russian Black Sea fleet annihilated a Turkish squadron in the Bay of Sinope, and the British cabinet thereafter decided that in consequence of this act the allied fleets of England and France must enter the Black Sea. On February 27 Great Britain presented an ultimatum to Russia demanding complete evacuation of the Principalities by the 30th April, and as the Czar refused to reply, the western Powers declared war on March 27 and 28.

As Austria and Prussia were not prepared to bring active, but only diplomatic, pressure to bear upon Russia, England and France were left to bear the burden of war alone, and the campaign proper began when the allied armies landed in the Crimea on September 14. The personal bravery and endurance of the troops were shown at the battles of the Alma, Balaclava, and Inkerman; during the terrible winter of 1854-55, and at Sebastopol and Kars. Misfortune, as in the loss of the transport steamer "The Prince," was aggravated by gross and incredible mismanagement both in the transport and commissariat departments. England alone

1832
to
1870

3,000 men and about £80,000,000 in one of the least credit-
wars in which she has ever been engaged. Students of human
and of human wisdom (or unwisdom) will notice that
as while it lasted the war was most popular with the majority
ple in England, the public opinion of two generations later
t unanimously endorses the dictum of the great statesman
ersely summed up the situation in the words, "England put
oney on the wrong horse."

one thing in the history of the war which later times have
sed without qualification is the work of Miss Florence
ingale and her band of trained nurses, who not only in-
ated a new profession, but, incidentally, opened another
or the entry of women into public life.

the terms of the Treaty of Paris (March 30, 1856) the Sublime
, on the invitation of the six Powers, who pledged themselves
ally and collectively to guarantee the independence and
rial integrity of the Ottoman Empire and repudiated the
to interfere either separately or collectively in its internal
s, was formally admitted "to participate in the public law
concert of Europe." The Black Sea was neutralised and with
ver Danube was declared open to the mercantile navigation
nations. Russia renounced her claim to an exclusive pro-
rate over the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia, which
granted complete independence under the suzerainty of the
. The Powers collectively guaranteed the liberties of the
ipalities and of Serbia. The Sultan on his part made a formal
taking to place his Christian on an equality with his Mussul-
subjects.

the Declaration of Paris, to which the Powers also sub-
ed, it was agreed to abolish privateering and to lay down as
lished principles of naval warfare that, except in the case
straband, (1) a neutral flag was to cover enemy goods; (2) and
neutral merchandise could not be seized under an enemy
and further that a blockade could not be declared unless it
acked by an adequate naval force.

w indecisive was the situation created by the Treaty of Paris
ext twenty years were to tell. The Crimean War was not only
ly responsible for a huge loss of men and money, but indirectly
ught about that state of unstable equilibrium from which
g the Franco-Austrian War of 1859, the Prusso-Danish of
the Austro-Prussian of 1866, the Franco-German of 1870,
usso-Turkish of 1878, and these in their turn created a condi-
of yet more unstable equilibrium with consequences in 1912
914 the ultimate results of which no man as yet can foresee.¹
en Lord Dalhousie left India in 1856, and made way for Lord
ng, he was convinced that the native army was loyal to the
h rule. But others, who had served England in India, Sir
es Napier and Sir Henry Lawrence, had uttered words of
r Crimean War see "Cambridge Modern History," vol. xi. ch. xi.

The
Indian
Mutiny
1857

1832
to
1870

warning which were disregarded. For thirty years before 1857 mutinies of greater or less magnitude had taken place, but had been officially hushed up. The annexation of the Punjab and of Oude, the growing belief that it was the aim of British rule to uproot the native religion and caste, the reports spread from mouth to mouth of England's military weakness as displayed in the Crimea, Persia, Afghanistan, and the Punjab—all these were elements contributing to a spirit of unrest concealed beneath apparent impassivity, but ready at the slightest touch to break out into overt acts. Cartridges for the new Enfield rifle, distributed to the native troops in 1853, were said—and in this case rumour was *not* a lying jade—to be smeared with the fat of cows and pigs. As to load the new rifle it was necessary to bite the cartridge, the act meant sacrilege to the Hindus and pollution to the Mohammedans. The gross tactlessness of allowing cartridges prepared in this way to be issued for use was aggravated by an official denial that they had been so prepared, and the feeling spread that a deliberate attempt was being made to set at nought the most sacred native beliefs. An outbreak at Meerut, where the whole native regiment mutinied, destroyed the European quarters, and butchered every European man, woman, and child, was followed by the march of the mutineers to Delhi, where the old Mogul King was proclaimed Emperor of India, the Christian churches desecrated, and the European inhabitants, chiefly women, massacred. The recapture of Delhi by the British was not sufficient to turn the tide of war. The horrors of the mutiny at Cawnpore exceeded those of Delhi; other massacres hardly less repulsive took place at Jhansi and in Bengal, the North-West Provinces, and Oude, and the Residency at Lucknow was besieged. Not indeed until January, 1859, were the mutineers, as an organised force, defeated by the efforts of Havelock, Outram, Nicholson, and Sir Colin Campbell.

The mutiny had made it clear that India could no longer be administered by a commercial company, and by an Act passed in 1858 the Queen was proclaimed Sovereign, with the Governor-General as Viceroy, the territories of the Company were taken over by the Crown, and the administration was entrusted to a Secretary of State, supported by a Council of fifteen members, nine of whom were required to have resided recently for ten years in India. The terms of the Queen's Proclamation, issued on November 1 (the wording was due to Lord Derby, who at the Queen's request drafted the document), show the spirit in which it was proposed to discharge these new responsibilities. "It is our royal will and pleasure that no one shall in any wise suffer for his opinions, or be disquieted by reason of his religious faith or observance. We will show to all alike the equal and impartial protection of the law, and we do strictly charge and enjoin those who may be in authority under us that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of our subjects on pain of our highest displeasure. It is our further will

East
India
Com-
pany's
terri-
tories
taken
over by
the
Crown
1858

so far as may be, our subjects of whatever class or creed fully and freely admitted to any offices the duties of which they be qualified by their education, abilities, and integrity duly to discharge."

1832
to
1870

the year 1858 at last crowned with success efforts extending a quarter of a century to secure the admission of the Jews into Parliament. An Act was passed empowering either House to pass by resolution the form of oath to be taken by its members. The Commons used the opportunity afforded by the Act to pass a resolution that the words "on the true faith of a Christian" should be omitted by Jews, and Baron Rothschild, who for ten years had been one of the members for the City of London, took the oath. In the same session, chiefly through the persistence of John Lubbock King, the property qualification for members of Parliament was abolished.

The years 1859 to 1866 are of surpassing interest to the student of the history of nations. To them belong Italy's successful struggle for national unity, under the leadership of Garibaldi, Cavour, and Ricasoli, in which the sympathies of the mass of Englishmen were with Italy; the American Civil War, in which the workers of the North of England, though they suffered cruelly, warmly espoused the cause of the Northern States; and the so-called Danish War of 1864, in which popular feeling in England was on the side of the Danes, while the Government stood aside, though interest as well as honour should have led them to throw their weight into the scales against Prussia. Palmerston, writing in 1863, expressed his deliberate opinion that at the bottom of the Danish design was "the dream of a German fleet and the wish to Kiel as a German seaport." He went on to add that any attempt to violate the rights and independence of Denmark would be England to her aid. Bismarck, however, had taken the measure of both the French Emperor and the British statesman, and Denmark was left to herself, and from the military point of view was decisively defeated.

Euro-
pean
Politics
1859
to
1866

The struggles, a mingled record of success and failure, of the English working classes were not only widening their political sympathies, but increasing their initiative and skill in affairs. The propaganda and practical experiments of Robert Owen had effected not only the intelligent working classes, but many of the ablest and most sincere among non-manual workers. The seed planted by the Rochdale Pioneers had spread widely and surely. In November, 1863, the Co-operative Wholesale Society, a federation of 45 societies, was established at Manchester. Beginning with a capital of 1400 £5 shares the Society grew rapidly, besides its business of selling, undertook manufacturing, transport, banking, insurance, and other activities by the end of the century when its annual turnover was to be estimated in many millions of pounds. The question of Parliamentary reform, so far as Parliament was concerned, had long lain dormant.

Working-
class
Organis-
ations

1832
to
1870

Reform
bill of
1866

But inasmuch as out of 5,300,000 adult males in England and Wales, only 900,000 had the vote and great urban populations increasing in numbers and self-consciousness were springing up, it was obvious that some changes would have to be made. Gladstone's Reform Bill of 1866 proposed to make the qualification for the boroughs £7 and for the counties £14, and to enfranchise lodgers, compound householders, and Savings Banks depositors who had had £50 continuously to their credit for at least two years. The Ministry were defeated and tendered their resignation. As Prussia, or rather Bismarck, had just engineered another war (against Austria) and the European situation was fraught with peril, the Queen was averse to accepting the proffered resignation, but Lord Russell persisted and Lord Derby was asked to form a ministry. This was the signal for a great popular demand for an extension of the Parliamentary franchise. Huge demonstrations were held at Trafalgar Square and in Hyde Park, in Manchester, Birmingham, Leeds, Glasgow, and many other towns. Disraeli, as leader of the House of Commons, introduced a bill of much wider scope than that which the House had rejected twelve months before. Nevertheless Parliament took the step which Lord Derby called "taking a leap in the dark," and Carlyle, with a profusion of dyspeptic epithet, denounced as "Shooting Niagara." By the new Act every householder paying rates, and having resided for one year, lodgers occupying rooms of the annual rental of £10, and in the counties all with a rating qualification of £12 were admitted to the franchise. J. S. Mill, supported by John Bright and Henry Fawcett, introduced an amendment in favour of women suffrage, which was thrown out by 196 to 73; other amendments embodying Mr. Hare's scheme of proportional representation met with some sympathy, but had to be withdrawn. The effect of the Act was to put on the register over 1,000,000 voters, while Gladstone's bill of the year before would not have added half the number.

British
North
America
Act,
1867.

The British North America Act of 1867 put an end to the friction between the two provinces of Canada by a wise compromise which allowed them local liberty, and initiated the first experiment in federalism under a constitutional monarch. The new Constitution for Canada established by the Act was expressly modelled upon that of the United Kingdom. The executive was vested in the Sovereign of the United Kingdom, represented in the Dominion by a Governor-General, who had command of the armed forces and the right to appoint or discharge the Lieutenant-Governors of the Provinces. The Legislature was to be composed of the Sovereign, the Senate of 87 members nominated for life by the Governor-General on the advice of his responsible ministers, and a House of Commons of 181 members. Similarly in each province there were to be a Lieutenant-Governor, appointed by the Governor-General, and an Executive Council. In Quebec, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick the Legislature was

osed of two Houses, but of only one in Ontario. Provision inserted in the Act for the admission of other colonies beside mentioned to the Dominion. The importance of this measure little understood at the time. Most English people thought it a mere stepping-stone to complete independence. Bright, d, thought the alternatives were independence or annexation e States, and even Disraeli with all his marvellous shrewdness imagination had not, or at least did not say that he had, begun receive the significance of such a policy in establishing the lations of Empire.

1832
to
1870

e appointment in 1867 of a Royal Commission of Inquiry the work and legal position of Trade Unions may be traced o causes. Trade Unions, increasing in numbers and in wealth, now become of national importance, and had aroused the lity of many employers, who began to unite in powerful ter-associations. The employees resorted to the weapon of rike, the masters retaliated with the lock-out. Some outrages, rticular one at Sheffield, where the Saw-Grinders' Union was ed to have instigated the exploding of a can of gunpowder in ouse of a workman who had deserted the union and was ing for a firm against whom they had struck, could un- tedly be traced to trade-union agency. Employers demanded the criminal acts of trade-unionists should be investigated. unions demanded an opportunity of clearing themselves of llegations made against them. Moreover, it had become clear ment that they must obtain legal protection for the large mulated funds by means of which they discharged their ions. By the Act of 1825, trade unions, as such, were no longer d associations, but they had as yet no legal status and could ake proceedings as corporate entities, even if, for example, they ed to take action against a defaulting secretary or treasurer.

Position
of Trade
Unions

1868 Gladstone carried a Bill for the abolition of compulsory ch Rates, which removed a legitimate grievance of English onformists; and in 1869 swept away a yet more intolerable indefensible anomaly by the Act for the Disestablishment and ial Disendowment of the English Church in Ireland. This ch, than which no body of people ever did less to justify a leged position, was a purely exotic growth. Episcopalians were than one in eight of the whole population, and in 199 parishes of 2428 this form of Christianity was wholly unrepresented.¹

Dis-
tablish-
ment of
English
Church
in Ire-
land

the revenues of this minority of 700,000 people (in 1868) ounted to £614,000 a year. By the Act of 1869 the Irish Church disestablished and its connection with the English Church inated. The four Irish bishops who had hitherto sat in the se of Lords were deprived of their seats. All beneficed clergy o retain their places and their net income for life, or commute o a life annuity and resign their charges. The grant to the olic College of Maynooth and the *Regium Donum* (to Presby-

¹ Brady, "English State Church in Ireland," p. 159.

1870
to
1914

terian ministers) were commuted on an equitable if not liberal basis. The Act has been an immense boon to the Disestablished Church, which being driven to rely upon itself and not on the insecure foundation of indefensible privilege has done more useful work in the fifty years during which it has been on a footing of equality than in all its previous history.

CHAPTER III

FROM THE EDUCATION ACT TO OUTBREAK OF EUROPEAN WAR 1870-1914

[*Authorities.*—An immense amount of material for this period has been accumulated, but much more remains, still to be made accessible and to be sifted for general readers, in official papers, in the records of numerous organisations, and in private diaries. The following is a brief selection: The "Cambridge Modern History" (vol. xii.); Paul's "Modern England"; MacCarthy's "History of our own Times"; Rose's "Development of the European Nations"; Marriott's "England since Waterloo" and "English Political Institutions"; Low and Sandar's "Political History of England (1837-1901)"; R. H. Gretton's "Modern History of England (1880-1910)"; Bright's "History of England (1880-1901)." Irish questions may be studied in Paul Dubois' "Contemporary Ireland"; O'Connor Morris' "Ireland from 1798 to 1898"; Plunkett's "Ireland in the New Century" and "New Ireland"; and in the Reports of the Bessborough (1881) and Parnell (1890) Commissions. On the subject of Egypt, Lord Cromer's "Modern Egypt" and Colvin's "The Making of Modern Egypt"; and for South Africa, Lucas' "South Africa"; Fitzpatrick's "The Transvaal from Within"; Cook's "The Rights and Wrongs of the Transvaal War"; De Wet's "Three Years' War"; V. Markham's "South Africa, Past and Present," should be consulted. The biographies of Queen Victoria (Lee) and King Edward VII. (Lee), of Beaconsfield (Sichel; Monypenny), the Duke of Devonshire (Holland), Gladstone (Morley), John Bright (G. M. Trevelyan), Lord Randolph Churchill (W. S. Churchill), Parnell (O'Brien) are indispensable. Working-class conditions and efforts to improve them are described in A. L. Bowley's "Wages in the Nineteenth Century"; C. Booth's "Life and Labour of the People of London"; Rowntree's "Poverty"; General Booth's "In Darkest London"; S. and B. Webb's "Trade Unionism" and "Industrial Democracy." The most recent and most authoritative general statement of the condition of the very poor in the British Islands is the Report of the Poor Law Commission, 1909. The annual volumes of the Co-operative Wholesale Society and the files of papers like the "Labour Leader," "Justice," "The Clarion," are a valuable index to movements of opinion among the organised working classes.]

THE Reform Act of 1867 brought one political era to an end and introduced another. Until 1832 political power in Great Britain had largely resided in the landed aristocracy; during the period between the two great Reform Bills (1832 and 1867) the centre of gravity had passed to the commercial and manufacturing classes. Henceforth the bounds of freedom and responsibility were to be extended to include the manual working population, whose interests much of the legislation of the next 40 years was to be concerned. In 1870 Gladstone, having dealt with one Irish difficulty, attacked another, but one much more thorny and complicated, the question of Irish land tenure. Ireland was seething with discontent, and Fenian outrages in England brought home to the average man the depth of feeling which Irish grievances, whether genuine or merely fictitious, had engendered. Irish difficulties with

Land
Reform
in
Ireland
1870

1870
to
1914

and have always sprung from the fact that English rule in Ireland in its earlier stages, and until well on in the nineteenth century, was an attempt to Anglicise a people whose national customs and traditions, for good or ill, were essentially different from those of their conquerors. The Report of the Devon Commission of 1845 made it clear for the first time that a serious agrarian problem existed in Ireland, due to the fact that by age-long tradition the Irish tenant believed himself to have customary rights in the land which he rented. The same commission recorded that in Ireland improvements were made by the tenant, not, as in England, by the landlord; that the landlords, when improvements were made, raised the rent; and that the feeling of injustice at this barefaced injustice led to crime. The effect of the "Encumbered Estates Act" of 1849 was to introduce a new set of landlords, who looked upon their estates as a mere commercial speculation out of which they extorted as much profit as possible. Peel's Act of 1860 laid down the principle, well meant, but sadly irrelevant to the facts of the case, that "the relation between landlord and tenant shall be deemed to be founded on the express or implied contract of the parties and not upon tenure or tenure in fee." Gladstone, who until he began to prepare his Bill had studied the subject, had the assistance of J. S. Mill and many distinguished authorities. Mill thought the only plan was to buy out the landlords, but this was felt to be too bold a step for the Government and the Bill after being severely mauled in both Houses was dropped and received the Royal assent. The main provisions of the Bill secured to the tenant compensation (1) in the case of being evicted for any other cause than non-payment of rent and (2) for unexhausted improvements made by himself or his predecessor. In Ulster tenant-right and similar customs were given legal recognition and something was done to facilitate purchase. Though the Bill was very far from being a settlement of the question, it was at least a great advance. Unfortunately for some time before the passage of the Bill through Parliament, and especially while it was being discussed, there had been a recrudescence of agrarian violence in Ireland, incalculably mischievous from every point of view. In 1847, well before these Acts of violence the Government carried through the Peace Preservation Act which forbade the use of firearms by the police and the constabulary, proclaimed by the Lord-Lieutenant, and the possession of firearms under any circumstances without a licence. The police were empowered (1) to enter dwelling-houses in search of arms or evidence to prove the authorship of threatening letters, and (2) to arrest any persons wandering about at night under suspicious circumstances. In cases where it was supposed to be impossible to secure a conviction, power was given to change the venue of a trial. So far as Irish history is concerned, 1870 was also remarkable for the beginning of the "Home Rule" movement by the formation of the Irish National League under the leadership of Isaac Butt, of the "Home Government Association of Ireland." This Society, which in 1873 was renamed

1870
to
1914

the "Home Rule League," was an organisation established to secure by constitutional means an Irish Parliament meeting in Ireland to legislate for and to regulate all internal affairs (finance included), leaving Imperial questions to be dealt with by the Imperial Government. It is curious in view of later events to note that no one attacked the new movement more bitterly than Gladstone.

Elementary
Education
Act,
570

Much more important for England than an Irish Land Act or the birth of a new Irish propaganda was the Education Act of 1870, for which Mr. W. E. Forster was mainly responsible, and which laid the foundation of modern English elementary education. England's neglect of popular education could only be described as scandalous. Other European countries, even some much weaker in material resources, were far in advance of England, where educational progress was hampered by stupid people who professed to believe that education was not the business of the State and by sectarians of one camp or another who were more concerned to defend their own vested interests than to have the rising generation educated. Forster on the other hand, whose sincerity has never been questioned, was possessed by a single-minded desire "to cover the country with good schools." His Act embodied three principles new to English public education: the compulsory attendance of children at school, a representative local authority, and a compulsory local rate. The whole of England for the purposes of the Act was divided into school districts, in towns the municipal borough being the unit and in the country the civil parish. Where accommodation for elementary scholars was insufficient, School Boards, in the boroughs chosen by the Town Council, and in the country by the Vestry, would be elected, charged with the duty of providing elementary education and empowered to levy a rate for the purpose. The expenses of the Board Schools were to be borne in equal proportions by the State, the local rate, and the parents of the scholars. Free schools might be established in very poor districts, and in any district the fees of very poor parents might be paid by the Board. An important point was left to the discretion of the local authority, whether in their district education should be made compulsory, and by the famous Cowper-Temple Clause, which the Government accepted as an amendment, it was provided that no catechism or other distinctive denominational formulary should be taught in any Board School, and that no voluntary school should receive assistance from the rates. In November the first School Board for London was elected by ballot, and a woman, Dr. Elisabeth Garrett, headed the poll.

my
reform

The spirit of reform was not confined to the sphere of education in this *annus mirabilis* of legislative activity. It even whisked away some of the cobwebs of the military system, the most costly, least efficient, and least enlightened of all the activities of the British Government. During Cardwell's tenure of office as Secre-

of State for War he reorganised (or rather organised) the less of his office under three departments, under the control of Commander-in-Chief, the Surveyor-General of the Ordnance, the Financial Secretary. All three were to be under the control of the Secretary of State, whereas previously the Commander-in-Chief could dispense patronage and exercise other powers without consulting the Secretary of State. As regards the Army, Cardwell desired, but rejected, the Prussian idea of compulsory service, contented himself with the attempt to make our small volunteer Army efficient. By royal warrant the practice of purchase-commissions, and subsequent promotion in the Army, was abolished, and in the Army Enlistment Act the short-service man and permanent reserve were established. In 1872, though raising the Army estimates by more than a million, he increased the number of soldiers at home by withdrawals from the Colonies. Another change, an immense advance on what preceded it, was the formation of "linked" battalions. The country was divided into territorial districts, each of which was to raise a regiment of the line, consisting of two battalions, one serving at home and one abroad, while the militia and the volunteers were to be grouped under the same Lieutenant-Colonel.

1870
to
1914

In 1870 belongs also another long-delayed change in public administration. Until the middle of the nineteenth century government Service appointments were regarded by a large portion of society as existing merely to provide avenues of emolument for their sons. From 1854 candidates for the Civil Service of India had to submit to competitive examination. An Order in Council of June 7, 1870, gave effect to proposals which, for the main, had been made by Sir Charles Trevelyan and Sir George Northcote as early as 1853. By the new Order all public offices, except those in the Foreign Office and Diplomatic Service, were only obtainable after open and competitive examination.

Admission
to
Civil
Service

Another anomaly was swept away by the Act of 1871, which abolished all theological tests for professors, tutors, fellows, and bachelors, a reservation being made in the case of college headships, certain fellowships, and of theological chairs and degrees in divinity. By this means Oxford and Cambridge were started on the way to becoming what they were not then, representative of the forms of faith in the country. Still some time was to elapse before it could be said that university life was a mirror of all classes in the nation.

Abolition of
Theological
Tests

Introduced by ballot, of which there had been some advocates as early as before as 1780 and at intervals ever since, was at last put into the statute book in 1872. Many were opposed to it on the ground that the vote is a trust and that the world should see how it was used. As in the case of most changes that have been brought about by struggle, its results have not been so pernicious as its opponents maintained they would be, nor so beneficial as its advocates believed. The man who wishes to do so can still

Ballot
Act

1870
to
1914

Public
Health
Adminis-
tration

find means to bribe and to intimidate without coming within the four corners of the law.

The Board of Health to which Edwin Chadwick had been appointed in 1848 came to an end in 1854, chiefly because of the unbending zeal of Chadwick and his collaborators for an efficient Health Administration. Chadwick was retired on pension, in other words cashiered, just at the time when he was at the zenith of his usefulness in the war against dirt and disease. It became clear to the more thoughtful minds that these twin evil spirits could only be driven out by carefully conceived efforts and by the joint endeavours of public and private agencies. A Royal Commission on the subject (1869) recommended (1) that a strong central authority should supervise the administration of all laws relating to public health and (2) that the charge of local public health administration should be entrusted to the municipalities. These recommendations, as has been the fate of many Royal Commissions, were for the time shelved, but in 1872, when Disraeli was developing the creed of the new Toryism in a series of speeches, he inscribed upon his banner, besides the maintenance of the Constitution and the Empire, the war-cry *Sanitas sanitatum omnia sanitas*. The Public Health Act of 1875 established a system of local health administration and codified the duties thus to be imposed on the municipalities. The charge of public health was handed over to the Poor Law Board without fitting it to assume these new and onerous duties or introducing any change, save to alter its name to the "Local Government Board." Nevertheless, the Act is important as it explicitly recognised that the care of the public health is a national responsibility.

Legal
Position
Trade
Unions

In 1871 the Trade Union Act for the first time gave legal recognition to trade societies, but the Criminal Law Amendment Act put further restraint upon the means (strikes, picketing, etc.) by which they endeavoured to enforce their demands. This was the signal for four years' determined agitation on the part of the organised workers who attained their desires by Mr. Cross' Trade Union Act of 1875. This measure brought to a close what is perhaps the most important period in trade-union history. It enacted that "an agreement or combination by two or more persons to do or procure to be done any act in contemplation or furtherance of a trade dispute between employers and workmen shall not be indictable as a conspiracy if such act committed by one person would not be punishable as a crime." Peaceful picketing was permitted, but certain kinds of intimidation likely to be used by trade unionists were forbidden under heavy penalties. Lastly, trade unions were legally protected as regards their funds.

The
Plimsoll
Load-
line

Samuel Plimsoll, member for Derby, had for some years devoted himself to the task of securing protection for British seamen by putting an end to the system which allowed them to go to sea in over-loaded and often over-insured ships. He was so far successful that the then President of the Board of Trade, Sir Charles Adder-

introduced a Merchant Shipping Bill, which would have given protection to seamen. When Disraeli announced that the Bill could be postponed, Plimsoll's indignation could not control him and he burst forth in a torrent of language which was quite parliamentary, but entirely true and justifiable. Moreover, to great scandal of lovers of precedent, he had volleyed forth his remarks not from his usual seat but from the middle of the floor. As a result he was suspended for a week, when he apologised for the irregularity of his outburst, but refused to withdraw the remarks he had made. During the week, however, public opinion emphatically endorsed his condemnation of "the villains who lead men to death and destruction," the Government passed as a temporary measure the Unseaworthy Ships Act, and in the following year the Merchant Shipping Bill empowered the Board of Trade to detain ships, but left with the owners the responsibility of finding a loadline for each voyage.

1870
to
1814

In 1875 Disraeli, on the suggestion of Greenwood, the brilliant author of the "Pall Mall Gazette," bought from the Khedive, who wished to dispose of them and probably would have done so to the disadvantage of Disraeli, his shares in the Suez Canal. This stroke, though opposed by some of Disraeli's advisers, appealed to the imagination of most Englishmen both in Parliament and out of it. Its author recommended it as an act of far-seeing imperial policy, not as a financial speculation. From the point of view of our position in the East, its effects have been marvellous; as an investment it has been extremely profitable, the shares which were bought for £4,000,000 are worth £30,000,000 and produce a dividend of 25 per cent. on the purchase money. Another felicitous stroke by the same hand, which appealed not to the imagination of the mass of Englishmen, was the Royal Warrant of 1876, by which the Queen was in future to be named Empress of India.

Purchase
of Suez
Canal
Shares
1875

Lord Sandon, Vice-President of the Education Committee in Disraeli's Ministry, carried in 1876 an Act of great importance in the history of elementary education. This measure carried to a new stage the principle of compulsion. It enacted that "it shall be the duty of the parent of every child to cause such child to receive efficient elementary instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic, and if such parent fail to perform such duty he shall be liable to such orders and penalties as are provided by the Act." The fees of poverty schools might be obtained by parents from the Poor Law Guardians instead of from the School Boards, without incurring the stigma of pauperism. No child might be employed at all under the age of ten, and no child between the ages of ten and fourteen without a certificate of having passed the Fifth Standard. To enforce attendance School Attendance Committees were set up in every district in England and Wales where no School Boards existed.

Compul-
sory
educa-
tion
1876

the Sand River Convention of 1852, as a result of which

1870
to
1914

South
African
Affairs

the Transvaal Republic came into existence as an independent state, the British Government conceded "to the emigrant farmers beyond the Vaal River the right to manage their own affairs, and to govern themselves without any interference on the part of Her Majesty's Government." This agreement, however, was subject to two important qualifications, that the Republic was to be open to all comers and that slavery was neither to be practised nor permitted. Sir George Grey, the far-seeing administrator under whose *régime* (1854-1861) Natal was granted an elected Legislature, was in favour of some form of federation and advocated this view in a State paper submitted to the Home Government in 1858. It is noteworthy that at this period the Orange River Boers were in favour of union or alliance on a federal basis with Cape Colony. By the South African Federation Bill of 1877 the Transvaal was annexed and the Boers promised autonomy under the British Crown. While the Bill was in progress through the House, two independent members, Mr. Leonard Courtney, as he then was, and Professor Fawcett, vigorously opposed the policy of annexation on the ground that it would lead to trouble later, and maintained with equal vigour that South Africa was not yet ripe for federalism. These criticisms fell on deaf ears, but time has amply justified them.

The
Near
East

As has already been pointed out, the Crimean War had brought no permanent settlement of questions in the Near East. Turkey had done nothing to improve the lot of the Christians within her borders, as she had undertaken to do by the terms of the Treaty of Paris. The administration of her finances was no less unsatisfactory and in October, 1875, the Sultan informed his creditors that he was unable to pay the interest on the debt. When the Sultan appeared unable to quell a revolt in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which had lasted for five months, the Emperors of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia communicated to Great Britain, France, and Italy, through Count Andrassy, the Austro-Hungarian Chancellor, a Note which laid down what, in the opinion of Russia and the Central Empires, ought to be the policy of Europe towards Turkey. The Porte should be required to carry out the promised reforms, to establish complete religious liberty, to abolish tax-farming, to guarantee that the taxes levied in Bosnia and Herzegovina should be applied for the benefit of those provinces, to introduce peasant ownership among the agrarian population, and to appoint a commission, half of whose members should be Christian and half Mussulman, to see that these reforms were carried out. The British Government endorsed the policy of the Note and the Sultan in January, 1876, consented to all its demands except that with regard to the application of the taxes.

1876

The insurrection, however, spread and the area of revolt was increased by the rising of the Bulgarians, upon whom the Turks inflicted the most savage and incredible barbarities. The French and German Consuls at Salonica were massacred by a mob of

mmedans. The Austrian, Russian, and German Chancellors
 t Berlin (May 11) and drew up a peremptory memorandum,
 demanded an immediate armistice of two months and the
 ration during this interval of refugees from Bosnia and
 govina. France and Italy accepted the memorandum, but
 and declined on the ground that she had not been consulted
 hat in any case the plan suggested would not succeed. On
 30 the Sultan was deposed and he was found dead on June 4.
 'rinces of Serbia and Montenegro declared war against Turkey.
 cts of atrocities committed by Bashi-Bazouks in Bulgaria
 to reach England, and Lord Derby, the Foreign Minister,
 gh the British Ambassador at the Porte, demanded from the
 n immediate and adequate reparation. By this time indigna-
 n England had reached a high pitch, but it was roused to
 by Gladstone's pamphlet "The Bulgarian Horrors and the
 on of the East," which was circulated far and wide. This
 is popularly remembered for its demand that the British
 nment, "which has been working in one direction, shall work
 other, and shall apply all its vigour to concur with the other
 s of Europe in obtaining the extinction of the Turkish Execu-
 -tior in Bulgaria. Let the Turks now carry away their abuses
 e only possible manner, namely, by carrying off themselves.
 Zaptiehs and their Mudirs, their Bimbashis and their Yuz-
 s, their Kaimekams and their Pashas, one and all, bag and
 age, shall, I hope, clear out from the province they have
 uted and profaned." On April 24 Russia declared war against
 ey, and when the Russian Army reached Adrianople in
 ury (1878) it became clear that the Turks would have to come
 ms. By the Treaty of San Stefano, 1878, Montenegro, Serbia,
 Roumania were to be recognised as independent of Turkey;
 reforms promised in Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Armenia were
 carried out; Russia was to have Batoum, Kars, and other
 ory in Asia; Bulgaria was to be constituted an autonomous
 ipality with a Christian Government and a national militia,
 tend from the Danube to the Aegean, and nearly as far south
 rianople and Salonica. Great Britain insisted that the Treaty
 d be submitted to a European Congress, which was held at
 n on June 8 and was attended by Lord Beaconsfield and Lord
 bury. Why these distinguished men should have taken the
 le to cross to Berlin is not obvious to the plain intelli-
 , seeing that Lord Salisbury had already (on May 30)
 d a secret convention with Count Schouvaloff, and a secret
 y had also been concluded with the Porte, by which England
 took to defend Turkey's Asiatic possessions and Turkey
 d to introduce reforms satisfactory to England in Syria, Asia
 r, and Armenia. By the Treaty of Berlin, which was signed
 uly 13, the terms of the Treaty of San Stefano were confirmed
 certain vital exceptions. Bulgaria was to consist of a narrow
 of land between the Danube and the Balkans and to have

1870
 to
 1914

Russia's
 Declara-
 tion of
 War,
 April 24,
 1877

Treaty
 of San
 Stefano,
 March,
 1878

Treaty
 of Berlin,
 1878

1870 autonomy under the suzerainty of Turkey. The area to the south
to of Bulgaria, Eastern Rumelia, was to be restored to the Sultan,
1914 and was to be administered by a Christian governor approved by
the Powers. Bosnia and Herzegovina were to be occupied by
Austria. This treaty was the cause of friction and misunderstanding
with Russia for nearly thirty years and it is highly question-
able if the policy of keeping the Turk in Europe has been justified
by results.

he The policy of annexation of the Transvaal was in the highest
rans- degree unsatisfactory to the Boer leaders, who persistently pro-
aal tested against it. The grant of a Crown Colony Constitution in
1879, after Sir Garnet Wolseley assumed the duties of High
Commissioner, disappointed expectations, which had been aroused
by Shepstone's promise of self-government. Gladstone's Govern-
1880 ment, which came into power in 1880, laid down the principle that
under no circumstances could the Queen's authority in the Trans-
vaal be relinquished. On December 16, Kruger, Pretorius, and
Joubert proclaimed at Heidelberg a Boer Republic. A British
detachment was cut up at Brunkerspruit. Sir George Colley was
checked at Laing's Nek and at Ingogo and heavily defeated at
1881 Majuba Hill (February 26, 1881). Sir Frederick Roberts, who
had been sent to South Africa, was recalled from Cape Town a day
after his arrival. While he was on the way Sir Evelyn Wood had
come to terms with the Boers at the Convention of Pretoria
(March 23) by which the Boers were granted autonomy under the
suzerainty of the Queen, but the foreign relations of the country
were to be under British control and there was to be a British
Resident at Pretoria for the protection of natives. The vacillating
policy of the British in this and other matters that appertained to
South Africa increased the difficulties naturally inherent in the
situation and the Convention of Pretoria no more settled the
South African question than the Treaty of Berlin solved the prob-
lems of the Near East.

1880 Less exciting but not unimportant problems were being handled,
Compul- if not solved, nearer home. In 1880, on the initiative of Mr.
sory Mundella, the son of an Italian refugee, who, by his own exertions,
Educa- had risen from the workshop to the position of a Minister of the
tion Crown, the provisions for compulsory attendance at elementary
schools were strengthened by a new Act which made it obligatory
on all School Boards and School Attendance Committees to pass
by-laws under the Act of 1870 instead of waiting for a requisition
from their parish. Further security was added to the position of
the workman by the Employers' Liability Act of 1881, though it
did not wholly remove the grievance at which it was aimed. Since
1837 it had been the decision of the Law Courts by what came to
be known as the doctrine of "common employment," that though
an employer was liable to strangers for an accident caused by his
servants, he was not liable to one servant for an accident brought
about by the carelessness of another. If an explosion at a mine

be traced to a miner, people at the pit-head who were
d by the accident could sue the mineowner, though other
s could not. The Act modified, but did not abolish, the
ne of "common employment."

1870
to
1914

adstone had been returned to power in 1880 on his indictment
a whole Disraelian policy. But there were breakers ahead
s own party, even if Disraeli had passed away and the system
hich he had stood seemed ignominiously beaten from the
Charles Bradlaugh, a militant atheist, who had been returned
ember for Northampton, asked to be allowed to make an
ation instead of taking the Parliamentary Oath, which
ed religious belief. Select Committees decided that he could
er make affirmation nor take the oath in its usual form. The
was taken to the Courts, which decided against him and
ed his seat vacant. He was re-elected four times by North-
on. Finally, after the election of 1885, Mr. Speaker Peel
red that he knew of no reason why Bradlaugh, whom North-
on had chosen for the fourth time, should not take his seat.
e passing of the Affirmation Act of 1888 freedom was given
upulous consciences to affirm instead of taking the more
oath.

Brad-
laugh
and Affir-
mation

a Bradlaugh case, which excited the most protracted and
it discussion both in Parliament and the country, was the
difficulty which beset Gladstone's Government. Others of a
serious kind were speedily to arise. Ireland had for long been
ng with disturbance. Evictions on the one hand, ceaseless
ion and outbreaks of lawlessness on the other, made the task
verning the country an unenviable one. Isaac Butt's Home
Party was not led with sufficient vigour to make it formid-
and it was not till Parnell, a leader of extraordinary tenacity,
and power, assumed the chief place, that the Irish Party in
ment began to make itself felt. The fact that 2590 agrarian
ges were reported in 1880 drove the Cabinet to ask Parlia-
that the Irish Executive should be equipped with still more
ent methods of repressing turbulence, and the first of many
ion Acts was passed, only after the fiercest discussion and
dogged obstruction on the part of members of the Land
e in the House of Commons. In the same year Gladstone
lf introduced a Land Act which gave to the Irish tenant free
ixity of tenure, and the right to have a fair rent fixed for a
l of 15 years by a judicial tribunal. The Act, however, did
o far enough to satisfy Parnell and his followers in the House;
land the number of agrarian outrages increased rather than
ished, and Parnell himself was arrested and lodged in Kil-
iam Gaol. Parnell and other leaders who had been arrested
subsequently set free; the Government were understood to
lling to deal sympathetically with the case of 100,000 small
ts who were unable to take advantage of the Land Act
se they were in arrears with their rents; the agitation for

Unrest
in
Ireland

1880

1870
to
1914

1882
Phoenix
Park
orders


the time at least died down, and it seemed as if a brighter day of mutual understanding between Great Britain and Ireland had begun. The new Viceroy, Lord Spencer, with Lord Frederick Cavendish, the Chief Secretary, made a state entry into Dublin on May 6. On the same evening Mr. Burke, the Under-Secretary, and Lord Frederick Cavendish, who were walking through Phoenix Park to the Viceregal Lodge, were stabbed to death by a gang of men who called themselves the Invincibles. The assassins had been lying in wait for Mr. Burke (they had on a former occasion waited for Mr. Forster, who by a mere accident due to an unpremeditated change in his travelling arrangements had escaped them), but as Lord Frederick went to the assistance of his colleague, he met the same fate. This dastardly act naturally aroused the utmost detestation, and many in Great Britain who were turning towards a policy of conciliation hardened their hearts. At Westminster the Nationalists had acquired the use of a new weapon of offence, the organised obstruction of debate, which was carried to such a pitch of efficiency that the House had to spend the autumn session of 1882 revising its rules of procedure.

Egyptian
minis-
tration

British responsibilities were soon to be increased in Egypt, which Russia had twice offered to England, and Bismarck at the Berlin Conference had suggested to England that she should take over, an opening which curiously enough Disraeli declined. The Khedive, who had sold his shares in the Suez Canal to Disraeli, had, by his tyranny and extravagance before and after that time, brought the country to the verge of ruin. In 1879 the Sultan was persuaded by the Powers to bring about the abdication of the Khedive, who was succeeded by his son Tewfik, a well-intentioned but invertebrate person incapable of coping with the discontent then rife in the army and in the country at large. On September 9 the Khedive found himself forced to give way to the demands of a large force, led by Arabi, which surrounded him in his palace. England and France, in a joint Note, promised their support to Tewfik in the restoration of order, but France afterwards withdrew when a rising at Alexandria, and subsequent bombardment of the town by the British, made it clear that drastic steps would have to be taken. A British army under Sir Garnet Wolseley was sent to Egypt; Arabi, after being totally defeated at Tel-el-Kebir, on September 13, 1882, was captured and sentenced to death, but finally banished to Ceylon. The British army was left in occupation until, but only until, order should finally be restored. This, however, meant that the British Government now had on their hands the responsibility of Egypt which they had previously declined.

el-el
Kebir

But events following the fall of Arabi were little calculated to serve the restoration of order in Egypt. The Arabs of the Soudan, a territory also included in the dominions of the Khedive, had been grievously oppressed by their Egyptian masters, and when Muhammed Ahmad, who professed to be the Mahdi or Messiah of



omise, rose in revolt, the Soudanese promptly joined him. With their aid he captured El Obeid and Kordofan. In November, 1883, General Hicks was sent by the Khedive to subdue the Soudan with a force which proved to be wholly inefficient, and which met with utter disaster at Shekan. On July 18, 1884, General Gordon was sent to Khartoum to deal with the situation. He soon found himself besieged by the Mahdists and his followers there. Inexcusable delays in sending reinforcements to him from home took place, and it was not till late in the year that Lord Wolseley left England to lead an expedition up the Nile. But through the inability of the Gladstone Cabinet to make up its mind, he had not been despatched soon enough.

On January 26 the Mahdi attacked Khartoum and Gordon. Although the Government were formally censured by the House of Commons and only just escaped censure in the Commons for their failure to support Gordon, they decided to abandon the Soudan and evacuate Wady Halfa, and owing to Gladstone's personal influence, which was sufficiently powerful to overbear strong Parliamentary opposition, the British force was withdrawn in 1885. In 1896, the Egyptian army, having in the meantime been reorganised by Lord Kitchener and Grenfell, the Khedive resolved on an attempt to recapture the Soudan. General Kitchener was appointed to the command of the Nile expedition with this object, and in 1898 with the victory of Omdurman accomplished the task. In 1884 the Government took up again the question of Parliamentary reform and committed themselves to a further extension of the franchise. The Bill which they introduced passed the House of Commons, but was rejected by the Lords, and an embittered conflict between the Houses was brought to an end by the personal intervention of the Sovereign, who, acting as peace-maker, brought the two Houses to a compromise. In the upshot the Conservatives accepted the Franchise Bill, and a Redistribution Bill was passed. The result of these two measures was to assimilate the county franchise to the borough franchise; to merge in the county areas those boroughs with less than a population of 15,000, and to deprive of their two-member constituencies those boroughs with a population of less than 10,000; and to divide the whole country into single-member constituencies, with the exception of certain universities and two towns which retained two members each. The sum was to add about 2,000,000 electors to the register.

On the return of 86 Irish Home Rulers at the first election under the new franchise completed Gladstone's conversion to Home Rule, to which he had for some time been leaning, and one of the most distinguished Liberals, Mr. John Morley, then Secretary of State, and Sir Charles Dilke, had been consistently advocating Home Rule. Gladstone introduced his first Home Rule Bill in 1886, and as a result a Land Bill. The opposition to these measures, which included Lord Hartington, Chamberlain, Bright, and many other prominent Liberals, was triumphant. Gladstone appealed to the

1870
to
1914

1885
Fall of
Khar-
toun
and
death of
Gordon

Parlia-
mentary
Reform
1884

Home
Rule
1886

1870
to
1914

country and was overwhelmingly defeated. Salisbury, whose specific for the Irish malady was twenty years of resolute government, became the head of a Conservative administration, and Mr. Arthur Balfour, who became Chief Secretary for Ireland, proceeded to administer the remedy prescribed by his Chief. A series of articles published in the "Times," entitled "Parnellism and Crime," sought to bring home to Nationalist leaders the responsibility for recent and increased outbursts of lawlessness in Ireland. Parnell asked for a Select Committee to investigate the charges brought against his colleagues and himself. This request was refused, but a year afterwards the Government appointed a Commission of three judges to investigate the whole activities of the Nationalist Movement. A facsimile letter, said to be by Parnell, which condoned the Phoenix Park murders, and which had been published by the "Times," was proved to be a clumsy forgery of an out-at-heel journalist, Richard Pigott, who confessed his crime, but shot himself at Madrid before the police could arrest him. The Report of the Commission, which was presented on February 13, 1890, declared that the respondents collectively were not members of a conspiracy to secure the absolute independence of Ireland, but that some of them had conspired to impoverish the Irish landlords and expel them from the country, and had incited to intimidation which indirectly, if not directly, led to crime. For the moment it seemed as if Parnell had cleared himself of the major charges against him, but shortly afterwards there was a violent revulsion of feeling when he made no attempt to defend himself in the divorce courts against the charge of adulterous relations with Mrs. O'Shea. The Roman Catholic Bishops, the majority of his own followers, Gladstone, and most people in England felt that he ought to retire from the leadership of his party. He fought fiercely to maintain his position, but wore himself out in a futile effort, which was terminated by his death in 1891 at the early age of 45.

Parnell-
ism and
Crime

The
Queen's
Jubilee
1887

If the condition of Ireland in 1887 was unsatisfactory to all parties concerned, new ties were being woven for other parts of the Empire. The celebration of the Queen's Jubilee in that year showed not only the profound respect and affection which the Sovereign had won, but proved that the monarchy had now become for the vast majority of her subjects the centre and rallying point of the Empire. At home the principle of self-government received further extension in 1888 by the establishment of elective county and district councils, consisting partly of Councillors directly elected by the ratepayers for a term of three years, and partly of Aldermen co-opted by the Councillors. Something was done to remedy one of the greatest national shortcomings—the lack of adequate technical instruction—by the Act of 1899, which authorised County or Borough Councils to supply or aid in supplying technical and manual instruction. The new interest in the care of the young both inside and outside of school was evinced by an important measure passed in the same year, introduced by a

Local
Govern-
ment

Educa-
tion

ivate member, Mr. Mundella. The Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act prohibited the employment of children under ten, and made it a misdemeanour to neglect or ill-treat them. The widespread Dock Strike of the same year, led to success by Mr. Tillet, Mr. Tom Mann, and Mr. John Burns, and supported large numbers of disinterested clergymen, journalists, ship-ners, and philanthropists, had two important results. The general public, which in this case almost universally sympathised with the 75,000 dockers on strike, realised, as most of them had not done before, that the whole fabric of commerce and industry rested on a foundation of ill-paid labour. The second effect was to restore confidence to the trade unionists and to increase their numbers to an extent hitherto unknown, and no longer to be waved aside by the irresponsible demands of self-seeking demagogues. The Conservative Administration has the credit of passing in 1890 the Housing of the Working Classes Act, by which local authorities were empowered to buy up insanitary areas and demolish insanitary buildings, to let out land to contractors on condition of building dwellings for the poor, and to sell to private persons buildings thus erected.

Of great importance also were the educational changes introduced by Sir William Hart Dyke, Minister of Education in Lord Salisbury's Government. In 1890 it was made possible to establish evening continuation schools, and the vicious system of "payment by results" was abandoned for a block grant, based on average attendances. In 1891, largely by the efforts of Mr. Chamberlain, who had included it in his "unauthorised programme" of 1885, and had never abandoned it, free education in the elementary schools of England and Wales became the law of the land. Mr. Stothews carried a measure for the improvement of factories and workshops, which limited the hours of women's labour to twelve a day, with an hour and a half for meals, and forbade altogether the employment of children under eleven in any workshop or factory.

Mr. Balfour, though during his tenure of office as Chief Secretary for Ireland he had rigorously carried on a *régime* of repression exemplified in the Crimes Act, did not confine himself solely to a policy of coercion. In 1890 he won great popularity among the poorest peasants in the poverty-stricken West of Ireland, either he had gone to see the condition of the people for himself, and by setting up in 1891 the Congested Districts Board. That in Ireland also at the very heart of the Empire there was a plague-spot of dire poverty was shown by the publication in 1891 of "In Darkest England and the Way Out," by General Booth, leader and head of the Salvation Army. The publication of Charles Booth's monumental "Life and Labour of the People in London" (begun in 1889 and concluded in 1903), embodying unbiassed conclusions of an army of skilled investigators, revolutionised the whole method of approach to the problem of

1870
to
1914

Social
Legisla-
tion

Social
Statist-
ics

1870
to
1914

poverty. The innumerable questions arising out of the condition of the masses were being sympathetically investigated and discussed, and remedies were gradually being found. In 1892 Mr. Mundella established at the Board of Trade a Labour Department, the business of which was, by the aid of correspondents in every large town and by other means, to collect, sift, and publish statistics concerning labour. The new Department was fortunate in beginning its course under the leadership of a very able statistician, Mr. Giffen, and with Mr. Burnett, who had been a manual worker, as its chief Labour Correspondent. At the Home Office Mr. Asquith made another useful and important departure by the appointment of women factory inspectors.

Gladstone's
Fourth
Ministry

The election of 1892 was a grievous disappointment to Gladstone who was returned to power with a majority of but 40. His second Home Rule Bill, introduced in February, 1893, differed from the first in retaining at Westminster only 80 members from Ireland, but with permission to vote only on Irish questions. This measure passed the Commons, but was thrown out in the Lords by a majority of 419 to 41. Immediately afterwards the Government carried their Parish Councils Bill, which introduced the elective principle into District and Parish Government. Early in the year 1894 Gladstone, who was now eighty-five years of age and desired an interval of quiet before the end came, resigned the premiership. His last speech in the House of Commons was a declaration that the grave differences between the Lords and the popular House must "go forward to an issue." Lord Rosebery succeeded Gladstone as premier and Sir William Harcourt became Leader of the House of Commons. The Budget which the latter introduced in 1894 is one of the landmarks of national finance. In it the Chancellor applied the graduation principle to the duties on succession and made the legacy duty identical on real and personal estate. The death duties were vigorously criticised at the time, but no political party since 1894 has proposed to abolish them and they are now a means of revenue adopted by all sections of the House.

Lord
Rosebery
Premier

Lord
Salisbury's
Third
Ministry

The Ministry resigned in consequence of being defeated on a snatch vote, and the Unionists at the ensuing election had a majority of 132, whereupon Lord Salisbury formed his third administration, in which several prominent Liberal-Unionists, the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Lansdowne, Mr. Chamberlain, and others, held posts. Largely owing to the influence of Mr. Chamberlain, the Government carried the Workmen's Compensation Act, which made employers liable for compensation even though their workmen had been guilty of "contributory negligence" and they had not. The Act was at first confined to mines, factories, railways, quarries, docks, and engineering sheds, but in 1900 it was extended to cover the case of agricultural labourers. In 1898 the Local Government Act substituted in Ireland popularly elected councils for grand juries. A Department of Agriculture and other industries

Workmen's
Compensation
Act, 1897

Technical Instruction in Ireland was established in 1899 on as suggested by Sir Horace Plunkett, the foremost agricultural farmer of his time, who became its first head. Unfortunately, year 1899 was to close with the outbreak of a war that was to us little glory. The discovery of gold in the Transvaal in 186 led to the influx into South Africa of a class of colonists whose sence was resented by the Boer farmers. The "Uitlanders" handed political rights suited to their economic importance. Boer Government, led by Oom Paul Kruger, refused to grant ir demands. On January 1, 1896, Dr. Jameson, the Adminis- or of the British South Africa Company, which had been orporated by Royal Charter ten years before, raided Transvaal tory with a force of 600 armed men. Jameson was heavily ated and he and his fellow-raiders were handed over to the ish Government. This abortive expedition increased the tion between the Boers and the "Uitlanders." A Committee he House of Commons was appointed to inquire into the cir- stances leading up to the raid, but as no punishment was icted on Cecil Rhodes, who knew that it was planned, the rs became filled with the idea that some scheme, not without knowledge of the home authorities, was in preparation to rivo them of their independence. Sir Alfred Milner, who was ointed High Commissioner in 1897, speedily declared himself atically on the side of the Uitlanders. A conference at emfontein in May, 1899, between President Kruger and Sir ed Milner proved abortive and on October 10 the two South ican Republics declared war against us. Until the opening ths of 1900 the campaign went disastrously for us, but the ointment of Lord Roberts as commander-in-chief with Lord chener as his second in command brought victory to British is, and the two republics were annexed by the peace of Vereenig- in 1902. The war, which was not a little due to tactless diplo- y in both England and South Africa, was grossly bungled n it started, but it had the salutary effect of showing England military weakness, and it did something to bring to an end the n of red-tape at the War Office.

n 1901 the blameless and laborious life of Queen Victoria came an end. Her frankness and truthfulness, her observance of stitutional limitations, her intense devotion to duty, the purity simplicity of her private life, brought about the paradox that n increasingly democratic age the popularity of the Crown ards the close of her reign was greater than it had ever been in istory, so far as the majority of her subjects were concerned. s popularity, if anything, tended to increase in the hands of immediate successor.

t the General Election of 1900 the Conservatives had appealed a patriotic vote to enable them to bring the war to a satisfac- r conclusion on the understanding that problems of domestic troversy would not be raised in the new Parliament. Never-

1870
to
1914

War in
South
Africa
1899
to
1902

Death of
Queen
Victoria
and ac-
cession
of
Edward
VII.

1870
to
1914
—
Educa-
tion Act,
1902

theless, highly controversial issues were raised by the Education Bill of 1902 which abolished School Boards, transferred the control of elementary education to County and Town Councils, and made the local rates available for "voluntary," i.e., denominational schools. The Nonconformists were displeased because in these schools the head teacher must belong to the denomination, though the secular education given in them was under the control of the public authority. The Act, however, though it left Nonconformists with a sense of grievance, was a distinct advance towards complete public control of elementary education. In the domain of Foreign Affairs Lord Lansdowne achieved a great personal success by his treaty of alliance with Japan, also to be assigned to 1902. In Ireland a conference held under the presidency of Lord Dunraven to consider the difficulties of the Irish agrarian question formulated a scheme which in principle was afterwards embodied in Mr. George Wyndham's Land Act of 1903, which bought out the Irish landlords, on the security of the British Treasury, leaving the tenant to pay off the purchase money in 68½ years by annual instalments less in amount than his rent had been.

Army
Reform

Under Mr. Balfour's *régime* the Army was reorganised in the light of the experience of the South African War. The office of Commander-in-Chief was abolished and the control of the Army handed over to the Army Council, over which the Secretary for War was to preside. Another measure of the highest importance, though its work is obviously not of a nature to be described in detail for public information, was due to Mr. Balfour's personal suggestion, the appointment of a Committee of Imperial Defence, over which the Prime Minister for the time being was to preside.

Sir H.
Camp-
bell-
Banner-
man's
Ministry

In 1903 Mr. Chamberlain, after his return from South Africa, advocated Colonial Preference as a means of welding together the several parts of the Empire. As he was unable to carry the Cabinet with him, though Mr. Balfour went so far as to accept "retaliation," he resigned his place in the Government to leave himself free to carry on a campaign in the country. The schism thus created, joined to the unpopularity of certain measures like the introduction of Chinese coolie labour into the Transvaal mines, so weakened the Government that Mr. Balfour resigned office in November, 1905, and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman undertook to form a Ministry. The ensuing election of 1906 resulted in an utter rout of the Unionist party, due not so much to the conversion of the electorate to Radicalism, as to a widespread feeling that the South African War, if it could not have been avoided, was grossly mismanaged in its earlier stages; to the determination of the industrial parts of the country not to abandon Free Trade, which at least gave them cheap food, for the alleged benefits of Protection; to the dissatisfaction of Nonconformists with the Education Act of 1902; and to the unpopularity among the organised workers of Chinese labour and of the Taff Vale judgment, which

arrived Trades Unions of the position which they supposed
 themselves to have. The most remarkable feature of the 1906
 election was the return to Parliament of an organised Labour party.
 The House of Commons had long had Labour members, who, with
 the exception of Mr. Keir Hardie, usually voted with Liberals,
 but the formation in 1893 of the Independent Labour Party de-
 terminately pledged to Socialism, and in 1900 of the Labour Repre-
 sentation Committee, a fusion of the Socialist and Trade Union
 movements, had made possible the return of a number of members
 pledged to act independently of the two older parties. The new
 Parliament proceeded to prohibit the further introduction of
 Chinese labour into the Transvaal mines; to confer self-govern-
 ment upon the Transvaal and Orange River Colony (which with
 Cape and Natal became in 1909 the South African Union); to
 reverse the Taff Vale judgment, by the Trades Disputes Act; and
 to authorise contributions from the rates for the feeding of neces-
 sary school children. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman resigned
 his Premiership on the ground of ill-health in 1908, and Mr.
 Asquith, who succeeded him, carried on vigorously the policy of
 clearing up arrears in social legislation. Old Age Pensions, which
 had been advocated by Tom Paine and by others after him, but
 which first had been made a serious issue by Mr. Charles Booth in
 1892 in his "Pauperism, a Picture, and the Endowment of Old
 Age, an Argument," were put on the statute book in 1908. The
 Royal Law Commission, appointed by Mr. Balfour in 1905, pre-
 sented in 1909 a Report, which was not only a masterpiece of
 literary skill and arrangement, but the most important document
 of this kind which had appeared for over 100 years. Indeed it is
 hardly an exaggeration to say that never in its history has the
 Government had at its disposal for the purposes of a public inquiry such
 a combination of disinterestedness, administrative capacity, wide
 experience, and knowledge of the subject investigated. All the-
 refore, the striking, therefore, are the words with which the majority
 of the Commission conclude their Report: "It is very
 pleasant to record that notwithstanding our assumed moral
 material progress, and notwithstanding the enormous expen-
 se, amounting to nearly sixty millions a year, upon poor
 relief, education, and public health, we still have a vast army of
 persons quartered upon us unable to support themselves, and an
 army which in numbers has recently shown signs of increase rather
 than decrease . . . the statistical review of the expense incurred
 of the results attained by it prove that something in our social
 organisation is seriously wrong, and that whatever may be the
 cause, they are not of such a nature as to be improved or removed
 by the mere signing of cheques or the outpouring of public funds."
 The Minority Report, a brilliant literary document, afterwards
 separately reprinted by its authors and widely circulated, was
 more strongly condemnatory of the Poor Law, but the wonder
 was not that the two sections of the Commission differed so widely.

1870
 to
 1914

The
 Labour
 Party

Social
 Legisla-
 tion

Old Age
 Pensions
 1908

Report
 of Poor
 Law
 Com-
 mission,
 1909

1870
to
1914

but that they agreed so much as to the causes of poverty and, to a surprising extent, as to the remedies to be applied.

A Bill to establish a University for Irish Catholics and an important Town Planning Act were carried in 1909, but the Government's most ambitious scheme, a Licensing Bill, was rejected by the Lords, just as in 1906 the Upper House had introduced such changes in the Education Bill that the Government, being unable to accept them, withdrew the Bill. The rejection of the Licensing Bill caused Mr. Asquith immediately to declare that henceforth the veto of the House of Lords must be the dominant issue of politics. Mr. Lloyd George's Budget of 1909, which embodied a scheme of land taxes highly unpalatable to the Lords, increased the friction between the two Houses, and Mr. Asquith determined to submit the questions of the Veto and the Budget to the decision of the country. At the subsequent election in January, 1910, the Liberals were returned to power, though with a greatly diminished majority. The 1909 Budget was sent back to the Lords, and the Government formulated their policy, which would have abolished the Lords' Veto on finance, limited the veto on other measures to two years, and reduced the duration of Parliament from seven to five years. The Lords, at the suggestion of Lord Rosebery, agreed to resolutions which admitted that a peerage should not of itself entitle its holder to a seat in the Upper House. In the middle of these hostilities King Edward VII. died, amid manifestations of sorrow, not only from all classes and parties in the Empire, but from other countries where he was hardly less popular than in his own. As it was felt that it would have been indecent to continue an embittered controversy while the grave had hardly closed upon a beloved Monarch, the leaders of the Conservative and Liberal parties entered into a Conference which considered not only the question of the veto, but some other controversial themes. As the Conference proved abortive, Parliament was dissolved, and appeal made to the country on the single issue of the Lords' Veto, with the result that in December, 1910, the verdict of January was confirmed. This mandate was translated into law by the Parliament Act of 1911. Two important measures, due to the party led by Mr. Asquith, may be mentioned not so much because of their particular application as because they are symptomatic of a complete change in public opinion with regard to social and industrial questions. Mr. Winston Churchill's Trade Boards Act of 1909 prescribed a standard wage for a class of workers who, until the passing of the Act, had been shamelessly sweated, and the later insurance scheme of Mr. Lloyd George adopted a general principle already in active use in some continental countries, especially Germany, and relieved a large number of industrial workers of the graver risks of sickness and disability. This measure also is not in principle objected to by any party, though there is very great divergence as to detail and method.

Death of
King
Edward
VII. and
Access-
sion of
King
George
V.

Trade
Boards
Act,
1909
Insur-
ance Act,
1911

The Home Rule Bill, which Mr. Asquith introduced in the use of Commons on April 11, 1911, proposed to confer on land the government through a Senate and a House of Commons her own internal affairs, with the exception of the Irish Land Purchase Scheme, Old Age Pensions, National Insurance, the Royal Irish Constabulary, and the Post Office Savings Bank, which were to be reserved as Imperial services. The army and navy, railways, and other Imperial subjects would be outside of the jurisdiction of the Irish Parliament, which would not be permitted to establish or endow any religion, or to impose disabilities for religious belief. The Lord Lieutenant could withhold his consent to bills passed by the Irish Parliament, and the Imperial Legislature could nullify or amend any Irish Act. This measure, which had kindled the most heated controversy in both Houses of Parliament, and the threat of armed violence in Ulster, the Protestant part of which desired to be excluded from the operation of the Act, became law, under the Parliament Act, on September 17, 1914. On the same day, and also under the Parliament Act, the Bill to establish the Welsh Church reached the Statute Book. The outbreak of civil war in Ireland, the rancour of party controversy, and continued manifestations of industrial unrest melted away, and left a united nation and empire to face the greater peril of European War.

1870
to
1914

Home
Rule for
Ireland

Welsh
Disestablishment

A bird's-eye view of the century from 1815 to 1915 reveals the most profound changes in every activity of the national life. In religion, if there is less church-going at the end of this period than in some other epochs, there is more real religion. The evil spirit of sectarianism is being slowly but surely driven out. Anglicanism and Nonconformity are not so much rivals as fellow-workers in the same field. Catholicism is learning from Protestantism, which is humbled by the lessons that the oldest Christian community has to teach. Judaism now takes its place on a footing of equality with one of the religious forces of a great free community. Above all, in practically every Protestant religious community, the battle of free inquiry has been won and tradition must give way to the message of truth and of the inspirations of our own day. Religious life is at the Universities, in Parliament, and elsewhere in public life, more alive than ever before or going.

The Monarchy, which in the time of George IV. had deservedly fallen into disrepute, in the Victorian epoch won not only profound respect, but warm affection. Victoria and her Consort, each wearing the white flower of a blameless life, won a securer place than falls to the autocrat and the absolutist, though observant of constitutional restrictions, ever growing in a country with a democratic tradition. Republicanism is not a living issue, and the monarchy is, for most British subjects, the silken thread that binds the Empire together. The aristocracy, which in 1815 consisted of hereditary owners of land, has received large infusions of those whose wealth has been won in the fields of commerce or industry,

1870
to
1914

and of some who had served at least their party if not the commonwealth. More and more it was becoming clear to them that "the chivalry of this age is the performance of public duty." The war of 1914 showed that they have lost none of the older chivalry of arms. Political power passed from the landed aristocracy to the commercial classes, and is now passing to the intelligent manual workers. England, which in the days of Waterloo was an agricultural country, has at the end of the century become a manufacturing and trading nation. The tale of exports and imports has mounted up, but the clamant need of commerce and industry is the application of science not only to means of production, but to methods of distribution. Whether England is to keep her commercial supremacy depends not on her attitude to the question of tariffs, but upon her willingness (or unwillingness) to submit all who are carrying on the operations of commerce, whether as leaders or manual workers, to thorough scientific and technical training as her greatest commercial rivals, Germany and the United States, have done. Agriculture, also, in England is sorely in need of the application of "brains," for though it is true that the best English farming is as good as any to be found elsewhere, the average when compared with countries like Holland, Denmark, Belgium, for example, is depressing. In general the educational outlook in England has features which are sadly unsatisfactory. Scotland, Wales, and even Ireland respect and love education for its own sake. In England it cannot yet be said that the people, as a whole, believe sufficiently in education to be willing to pay for it. It is not merely that we are behind the great nations, but the educational average of poor and geographically small nations like the Scandinavian countries, Holland, Denmark, Switzerland, ought to bring shame to any candid English traveller who has sufficient intimacy with those countries to form a judgment. This and "the condition of the people" question are the two most serious problems bequeathed by the nineteenth century to the twentieth. Notwithstanding the colossal increase in the sum total of the national wealth, it is still true, in 1915 as in 1815, that we have not yet learnt to distribute material wealth equitably, though we have immeasurably increased its production. The Report of the Poor Law Commission of 1909, the investigations of the Rt. Hon. Charles Booth, and numerous other disinterested inquirers, have proved indisputably that an enormous proportion of the manual workers, whether of the towns or of the country, a proportion frequently extending to one-third of the total population in given areas, is endeavouring to live upon a wage insufficient even for decent physical maintenance. The hopeful elements in the situation are that this maldistribution of wealth is common to other industrial countries, though it is worst in the British Islands and the United States, and that, so far as ourselves are concerned, great numbers of the ablest and most disinterested men and women in all classes

of the community and of every shade of religious and political belief are devoting themselves to the scientific study of social and industrial questions, and to the practical experiments by which one solution will be found. The lamentable war of 1914, the greatest catastrophe that has ever befallen the human race, has proved that throughout the British Islands as in the Colonies there is no widespread or deep-seated deterioration, either physical or moral; that the spirit of dogged resistance to tyranny and the eradicable love of justice are still present in the children of a race which, though its history has been stained by many blunders and not a few crimes, has yet attained to a greater measure of freedom combined with security than any other State has known.

1870
to
1914

CHAPTER IV

A SUMMARY OF EVENTS, 1914-1950

SECTION I.—THE FIRST WORLD WAR, 1914-1918

[*Authorities.*—Sir Winston Churchill, "The World Crisis," 4 vols. (1923-1929); Sir J. E. Edmonds, "Official History of the Great War," vols. (1928, etc.); Sir C. P. Lucas, "The Empire at War," 3 vols. (1921, etc.).]

DECLARATIONS OF WAR

- 1914. Austria-Hungary on Serbia, 28 July; Germany on Russia, 1 Aug.; Germany on France, 3 Aug.; Britain on Germany, 4 Aug.; Germany on Belgium, 4 Aug.; Montenegro on Austria-Hungary, 7 Aug.; France on Austria-Hungary, 10 Aug.; Britain on Austria-Hungary, 12 Aug.; Japan on Germany, 23 Aug.; Britain on Turkey, 5 Nov.
- 1915. Italy on Austria, 23 May; Italy on Turkey, 20 Aug.; Britain on Bulgaria, 15 Oct.; France on Bulgaria, 16 Oct.; Italy on Bulgaria, 19 Oct.
- 1916. Albania on Austria, 11 Jan.; Germany on Portugal, 9 Mar.; Rumania on Austria, 27 Aug.; Italy on Germany, 28 Aug.; Germany on Rumania, 28 Aug.; Turkey on Rumania, 30 Aug.; Bulgaria on Rumania, 1 Sept.
- 1917. U.S.A. on Germany, 6 April; Cuba on Germany, 7 April; Austria on U.S.A., 8 April; Bulgaria on U.S.A., 9 April; Panama on Germany, 10 April; Siam on Central Empires, 22 July; China on Germany, 14 Aug.; China on Austria, 11 Sept.; Brazil on Germany, 26 Oct.

MILITARY EVENTS

France and Flanders:

- 1914. German invasion of Belgium begun, 4 Aug.; Brussels entered, 20 Aug.; Namur captured, 23 Aug.; Antwerp taken,

- 9 Oct. Bs.: Mons, 23-4 Aug.; Le Cateau, 26 Aug.; Marne, 7-10 Sept.; Aisne, 12-15 Sept.; Ypres, 19 Oct.-22 Nov.
1915. Bs.: Neuve-Chapelle, 10-13 Mar.; Ypres, 22 April-25 May (first German attack with gas, 22 April); Festubert, 15-25 May; Loos, 25 Sept.-8 Oct.
1916. Bs.: Verdun, begun 21 Feb. (Douaumont, 25 Feb. and 24 Oct.); Somme, 1 July-18 Nov. (Beaumont-Hamel, 13 Nov.); Verdun, 15 Dec.; Ancre, 13-18 Nov.
1917. German retreat to Hindenburg Line, 14 Mar.-5 April. Bs.: Arras, 9 April-4 May (Vimy Ridge, 9-14 April; Scarpe, 9-14, 23-4 April, 3-4 May); Chemin des Dames, 5 May; Bullecourt, 3-17 May; Messines, 7-14 June; Ypres, 31 July-10 Nov. (Passchendaele, 12 Oct., 26 Oct.-10 Nov.); Verdun, 20 Aug.; Cambrai, 20 Nov.-3 Dec.
1918. Bs.: Somme, 21 Mar.-5 April; Lys, 9-29 April (Kemmel Ridge, 17-19 April); Aisne, 27 May-6 June; Marne, 18 July; Ourcq, 23 July-2 Aug.; Amiens, 8-11 Aug.; Bapaume, 21-31 Aug.; Somme, 21 Aug.-3 Sept.; Arras, 26 Aug.-3 Sept. (Drocourt-Quéant, 2-3 Sept.); Sainte-Mihiel, 12 Sept.; Hindenburg Line, 12 Sept.-9 Oct. (Épéhy, 18 Sept.; Cambrai, 8-9 Oct.); Ypres, 28 Sept.-2 Oct.; Selle River, 17-25 Oct.; Valenciennes, 1 Nov.; Sambre, 4 Nov.

Prussia—Poland—Russia—Austria-Hungary :

1914. Bs.: Tannenberg, 26-9 Aug.; Lemberg, 31 Aug.-2 Sept.; Augustovo, 1-4 Oct.; for Warsaw, 15-20 Oct., 18 Nov.-28 Dec.; Lodz, 1-5 Dec.
1915. Przemyśl surrendered to Russians, 22 Mar.; recaptured, 3 June; Lemberg retaken, 22 June; third b. for Warsaw, 19 July; Warsaw evacuated by Russians, 5 Aug.; Kovno stormed, 7 Aug.; b. of Brest-Litovsk, 26 Aug.; b. of Tarnopol, 7-8 Sept.; Vilna taken by Germans, 17 Sept.
1916. B. of Lake Narotch, Mar.-April; Russian offensive in Ukraine, 4 June; in E. Galicia, 8 June; near Baronovitchi, 13 June; near Brody, 15 July.
1917. Russian offensive at Brzezany, 1 July; b. of Halicz, 10 July, 23 July; fall of Riga, 3 Sept.
1918. Odessa occupied by Germans, 13 Mar.

Rumania :

1916. Invasion of Transylvania, 28 Aug.; Silistria taken by Bulgarians, 12 Sept.; Constanza taken by Bulgarians, 22 Oct.; Bukarest occupied by Germans, 7 Dec.
1917. Evacuation of the Dobrudja, 8 Jan.; Galatz evacuated, 11 Jan.

Dardanelles :

1915. Landing at Cape Helles, 25-6 April; bs. for Krithia, 28 April, 6-8 May, 4 June; Anzac bs., 25 April-30 June; landing

at Suvla, 6-15 Aug.; Suvla bs., 6-21 Aug. (Sari-Bair, 6-10 Aug.). Evacuation of Dardanelles declared, 8 Dec.
1916. Evacuation completed, 8 Jan.

ly :

1915. First b. of the Isonzo, 2-29 July.
1916. B. of Trentino, 14 May-16 June; b. of Gorizia, 6-14 Aug.
1917. Italian offensive on Isonzo, 14 May-10 June; Italian attack between Tolmino and sea, 19 Aug.; b. of Caporetto, 24 Oct.-18 Nov.
1918. B. of Piave, 15-23 June, 26 Oct.; b. of Vittoria Veneto, 24 Oct.-4 Nov.

lkans :

1915. Allied landing at Salonika, 5 Oct.; fall of Üsküb, 22 Oct.; b. of Kachanik, 4 Nov.; fall of Monastir, 2 Dec.
1916. Cetinje taken, 1-3 Jan.; Durazzo taken, 24 Feb.; Monastir retaken, 23 Nov.
1917. B. of Doiran, 24-5 April, 8-9 May.
1918. B. of the Vardar, 15-25 Sept.; b. of Doiran, 18-19 Sept.; Üsküb retaken, 30 Sept.

pt, Palestine, and Arabia :

Operations against the Senussi, Nov. 1915-Feb. 1917; b. of Rumani, 4-5 Aug. 1916; bs. of Gaza, 26 Mar.-7 Nov. 1917; capture of Jerusalem, 7-9 Dec. 1917; of Jericho, 19-21 Feb. 1918; b. of Megiddo, 19-25 Sept. 1918; Arab rising against Turks began, 7 June; Mecca taken, 10 June.

sopotamia—Persia :

1915. B. of Kut, 28 Sept.; b. of Ctesiphon, 22-4 Nov.
1916. Kermanschah taken by Russians, 26 Feb.; B. of Sanna-i-Yat, 6-22 April.
1917. British occupied Bagdad, 11 Mar.; Samaria, 19 Sept.; Ramadi taken, 28 Sept.; b. of Sherghat, 30 Oct.

ica :

E. Africa. Tanga operations, Nov. 1914; surrender of Mafia Is., 12 Jan. 1915; Tanga occup., 7 July 1916; Dar-es-Salaam surrendered, 4 Sept. 1916; final surrender, 25 Nov. 1918.

W. Africa. Luderitzbucht occupied, 18 Sept. 1914; occupation of Windhoek, 12 May 1915; German capitulation, 9 July 1915.
Cameroons. Capture of Duala, 26 Sept. 1914; of Mora, 8 Sept. 1916.

Togoland. Lome captured, 8 Aug. 1914.

E. Africa. Rebellion began, 15 Sept. 1914; surrender at Reitz, 4 Dec. 1914.

casus :

Arzerum taken, Feb. 1916, retaken, Mar. 1918; Trebizond taken, April 1916, retaken, Mar. 1918; Erzingan taken, July 1916,

retaken, Mar. 1918; Batum occupied, April 1918; Baku evacuated by British, 14 Sept. 1918.

N. Russia—Siberia :

Kem occupied, 7 June 1918; Irkutsk occupied by Czechoslovakians, July 1918; Dukhovskaya, 23 Aug. 1918; Archangel occupied, 1 Aug. 1918; Troitsa, 10 Aug. 1919; British evacuation, 27 Sept. 1919.

NAVAL EVENTS

1914. *Goeben* and *Breslau* reach Turkey, 11 Aug.; blockade of Kiaochow, 27 Aug.; b. of Heligoland Bight, 28 Aug.; siege of Tsingtao, 23 Sept.—5 Nov.; H.M.S.s *Aboukir*, *Hogue*, and *Cressy* torpedoed, 22 Sept.; b. of Coronel (Adm. Cradock's squadron lost), 1 Nov.; Kiaochow surrendered, 7 Nov.; German cruiser *Emden* destroyed, 9 Nov.; b. of Falkland Is. (Spee's squadron sunk), 8 Dec.; Germans bombard Yorkshire coastal towns, 16 Dec.; seaplane raid on Cuxhaven, 25 Dec.
1915. B. of Dogger Bank, 24 Jan.; German submarine blockade of Britain opened, 18 Feb.; British attack on Dardanelles forts, 19 Feb.; again, 4–7 Mar.; German cruiser *Dresden* sunk 14 Mar.; *Lusitania* torpedoed, 7 May; *Königsberg* destroyed in Rufiji river, 11 July.
1916. Germans bombard Lowestoft, 25 April; b. of Jutland, 31 May; H.M.S. *Hampshire* with Kitchener aboard mined off Orkneys, 5 June; Allies bombard Athens, 1 Sept.; blockade of Greece, 19 Sept.
1917. Suffolk coast bombarded, 26 Jan.; Germans begin unrestricted submarine warfare, 1 Feb.; H.M.S.s *Swift* and *Broke* figure in a destroyer action in the Channel, 23 April; Ramsgate shelled, 27 April; first U.S. destroyers arrive, 3 May; British naval success in Kattegat, 2 Nov.
1918. Germans bombard Yarmouth, 14 Jan.; British blocking attack on Zeebrugge and Ostend, 22–3 April; another on Ostend, 9–10 May; German naval meeting at Kiel, 10 Nov.; Allied fleet passed through Dardanelles, 12 Nov.; German fleet surrenders, 21 Nov.

ARMISTICES AND TREATIES

- Armistices: Central Powers—Russia, 29 Nov. 1917; Rumania—Central Powers, 7 Dec. 1917; Central Powers—Ukraine, 9 Feb. 1918; Allies—Bulgaria, 29 Sept. 1918; Allies—Turkey, 30 Oct. 1918; Allies—Austria-Hungary, 3 Nov. 1918; Allies—Germany, 11 Nov. 1918.
- Peace Treaties: Brest-Litovsk, between Russia and Germany, 2 Mar. 1918; preliminary peace between Rumania and Central Powers, Buftea, 5 Mar. 1918; ratified, 7 May 1918; annulled at

Versailles, 1919. Versailles, signed by the Allies and Germany, 29 June 1919; ratified in Paris, 10 Jan. 1920. Saint-Germain, between Allies and Austria, signed, 10 Sept. 1919; ratified in Paris, 16 July 1920. Trianon, between Allies and Hungary, signed, 4 June 1920. Neuilly, between Allies and Bulgaria, signed, 27 Nov. 1919; ratified in Paris, 9 Aug. 1920. Sèvres, between Allies and Turkey, signed, 10 Aug. 1920 (never ratified). Lausanne, between Allies and Turkey, signed, 24 July 1923; ratified, autumn 1923.

NOTE.—The following section is adapted from Douglas Jerrold's "England: Past, Present, and Future" (1950), by kind permission of the author.

SECTION II.—1918-1939

Authorities.—"Documents on British Foreign Policy, 1919-1939" (E. L. Woodward and R. Butler); D. C. Somervell, "British Politics c 1902" (1950); H. Kohn, "The Twentieth Century" (1950).]

December 1918 Mr. Lloyd George, at the head of the National Coalition which perhaps too loudly claimed to have won the war, appealed to the country for a mandate to win the peace. The electoral base was made to an electorate just increased from under seven millions in 1914 to over twenty millions. The vast new electorate could clearly no longer be regarded as the masters. Its members visibly became the clients of the rival political caucuses. As the customer is always right, flattery, after 1918, displaced argument as the chief political weapon. It was in the new spirit that Lloyd George proposed to celebrate the victory of 1918 by giving Britain a land fit for heroes to live in. The new electorate, bonded with alacrity to the new blarney, and returned "the blithiest, the least intelligent, and the least representative House of Commons since Waterloo." The chief reason for this unbalancing historic political forces was the suddenness of the reaction from deep-seated pessimism general throughout the country until a few weeks before the armistice.

As the election campaign proceeded, ministers were stampeded by public pressure, as they conceived it, into all kinds of vindictive promises and impossible promises about living conditions. Whether the men who made these promises were ignorant or deceitful must remain a matter of opinion, but the fact remained that, with the end of the war, the whole political and economic fabric of Europe collapsed. Anarchy, unemployment, and starvation were rife; the effects of the disaster would not, and could not, be confined to the territories and peoples of our late enemies, nor should of any political experience have imagined otherwise.

The lasting evil of the First World War arose from its character as a "civil war" within the framework of the old European order, and its really damaging effects were, as with all civil wars, moral. The citizens of all the Western European countries after 1918 suffered a loss of faith. They no longer believed in the mission and destiny of their traditional civilization and were therefore disinclined to effort or sacrifice. The result, once the boom was over, was a feverish search for security, for indemnities, for reparations, for a system of organization through which the nations of post-war Europe could secure, at someone else's expense, the benefits which they had come to claim as a right and had ceased to regard as the rewards of prudence, virtue, and thrift. It was the error both of "Homes for Heroes" and "Organization for Peace," those two slogans which echoed through England from 1918 to 1931, that these desirable things were to be supplied to all who needed them by third parties—to the working man by the State, to the British people by the League of Nations. The same attitude of nerveless optimism was responsible for the grotesque and impossible demands made on Germany for reparations by all the signatories to the Treaty of Versailles. No one had the courage to place any limit to the day-dreams which kept them from contemplating the hard realities of a world at once tired, impoverished, and discontented.

The basic evils of the inter-war international situation had, however, been written into the peace treaties and the League of Nations Covenant, and, once these were confirmed as the foundation of the public law of Europe, there was little or nothing to be done, within their framework, which could remedy a situation fraught with danger from the very first. The first of these evils was the substitution for the long-established principle of nationality of a narrow racialism. The second evil was the failure—rendered all the more disastrous by the ill-chosen racial basis of the new order—to make the League of Nations an effective agent of peaceful change. For both these evils the liberal belief in the natural wisdom and virtue of man was at bottom responsible. The theory was, in fact, plain nonsense, flying in the face of every lesson of history, to say nothing of every precept of Christian teaching.

The frontiers of the new Poland, obviously the most vulnerable of all the new states, were strategically indefensible. The Austro-Hungarian Empire was split up into a number of states, none of which was economically viable. The Baltic republics existed from the very start purely by grace of Russia. Germany was left intentionally without a frontier, with her territory cut in two by the Polish Corridor, with a large group of her population on the wrong side of the Czechoslovakian frontier, and crippled by an undisclosed liability for reparations. By rendering Germany permanently unstable politically, we destroyed the possibility of peace for the rest of Europe. We also placed the whole world on

horns of a dilemma. By the balkanization of Southern and Western Europe we created a situation in which a stable regime, if ever arose in Germany, would find no effective barrier to German expansion either south or east. If, on the other hand, Germany remained disorganised, discontented, and impoverished, there could be no effective European recovery. Meanwhile, the French frontier remained as vulnerable in 1919 as it had been four years before.

It was inevitable, after the temporary boom of 1919-20, that Germany, as the one great free-trade country, should be the principal sufferers from the world chaos. By February, 1921, the unemployed were over a million and before the end of the year they had reached a staggering total of 2,038,000. The public temper was not rendered more sympathetic to Mr. Lloyd George's administration by the conduct of affairs in Ireland where the Sinn Féin rebellion came to a head in 1920 and the British Government had taken a desperate decision to engage themselves in a guerrilla warfare with the rebels. Nor was Ireland the only storm centre in the British Empire. There was widespread unrest in India, and the British Government had thought it necessary to introduce a sweeping measure of constitutional reform which, since it conceded the form and withheld the substance of self-government, weakened the authority without adding either to our prestige or our popularity.

The lack of realism with which Mr. Lloyd George had approached the British economic problem was reflected also in his approach to what became for some years the central problem of Anglo-German relations with Germany, the problem of reparations. In November 1920 the Brussels Conference fixed the total of reparations due from Germany at £12,412,000,000 to be paid within five-and-a-half years. This absurdity prejudiced the whole course of relations between Germany and the western powers. The result was a steady depreciation of the German mark, which had fallen to nearly 12,000 to the £ in October, 1922. The world was suffering for the first, but not, unfortunately, for the last, time in the conduct of its affairs by men eminently capable of conducting them if only they had known the purpose for which they were doing so. As it was, we were only re-creating an angry and aggressive Germany.

That was the sum, as the British people saw it at the time, and history has seen it since, of Mr. Lloyd George's Western European policies. His Irish policy had already ended, as Lord Carson aptly observed in the House of Lords, in his "surrender at the point of a revolver." His reconstruction policy had ended with 1,000,000 unemployed. In August, 1922, his pro-Greek policy, which had given Smyrna for five years to our rather unwilling Greeks, also collapsed. The Turks, led by Mustapha Kemal, drove the Greeks out of Asia Minor and invaded the neutral zone of the

Dardanelles. And so we come to October, 1922, a month which notably foreshadowed the shape of things to come but also registered a great and pregnant change in the existing balance of forces in Europe.

In October, 1922, three things happened. Our French-Italian allies deserted us at Chanak;¹ the dominions also refused to support our stand against Mustapha Kemal, with whom we were forced to negotiate and almost immediately to make peace on his own terms. In this nadir of Britain's fortunes, Mr. Lloyd George was driven from office by the rising indignation of the Conservative party. At the same time the last of the historic succession of Turkish sultans was driven from his throne and Turkey became the second of the dictatorships which were soon to dominate Europe. The third of the dictators was close at his heels. On October 31 the King of Italy called on Mussolini, who had just arrived in Rome at the head of his Fascist militia, to form a government. The rise to supreme power of these two men of limitless energy, audacity, and ambition was contemporaneous with the appointment as Prime Minister of Great Britain of a dying man, Mr. Andrew Bonar Law. He succeeded to an unpleasant heritage but secured the suffrage of the British people on his programme of tranquillity. Mr. Lloyd George, after having for six years enjoyed greater personal power than probably any other statesman in our history, fell from office, never to return.

With Mr. Bonar Law, the Conservatives returned to power as well as public office for the first time since 1905. They were at once confronted with the issue of unemployment, a problem which was to dominate the political scene for a generation to come.

Unemployment reached its first peak under Mr. Lloyd George and as the direct, if not intended, result of the deflation of 1920-21 which crippled our export trade. Deflation, however, coincided with the end of the sellers' market which inevitably followed the war, and it is wrong to suppose that a wiser monetary policy would have done more than mitigate unemployment, which was due to a number of different causes perfectly well known to students of elementary economics.

Mr. Bonar Law had resigned after a few months of office and was succeeded by Mr. Stanley Baldwin, who showed his independence and his intention to rule when he committed himself, in defiance of Mr. Bonar Law's pledges, to the introduction of a protective tariff. He did so, it is said, without realizing that in the circumstances the decision made it necessary for him to ask for a dissolution and seek a mandate for the new policy. As we know, the two free-trade parties, the Liberal party superficially reunited under Mr. Asquith, and the Labour party now under Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, won a decisive victory over Mr. Baldwin at the election of December, 1923. In the new Parliament these

¹ Where the British and Turkish forces faced each other.

erties combined to defeat the Conservative Government, and Mr. Ramsay Macdonald became the first Labour Prime Minister. After a few uneasy months his Government was defeated by a combination of Conservatives and Liberals, and at the ensuing election in October, 1924, Mr. Baldwin won a great victory. He did, however, pledged himself not to introduce a protective tariff, on the ground that the country had voted against it less than a year before at an election held on this specific issue.

There was, indeed, lurking in Mr. Baldwin's decision of 1924 the germ of a new and dangerous constitutional doctrine, derived beyond a doubt from the fear of the vast new electorate, that the duty of government is to reflect the majority opinion, and that the proper course before an election is to put forward the programme which contains the largest measure of prudence and common sense consistent with a reasonable chance of obtaining a majority. Such a doctrine implies that the electorate can confer a "mandate" and that a government has not only the right but the duty to act on it. This highly contentious doctrine in turn tends to transform the House of Commons from a sovereign assembly into an assembly of delegates and to reduce the cabinet from the high estate of Ministers of the Crown to the lowly rank of the hired servants of a caucus. We shall see that this view of the constitution and of the relationship between the king's ministers and the electorate was to gain ground and lead the country into grave difficulties in 1931 and again in 1935.

The fear of the electorate was due mainly to the fact that just then, for the first time in British parliamentary history since the reign of Queen Anne, really fundamental issues divided the Government from the Opposition, British statesmen had to face an immense new electorate of twenty millions without the party machinery necessary to bring the real issues home to the nation as a whole. The first of these issues, in 1925, was Socialism itself, and second the Socialists' approach to the pressing international problems.

The fundamental difference in regard to Socialism needs no elaboration. Socialism can be, as Mr. Ramsay Macdonald wished to be, introduced gradually, but each step is by its nature irreversible. It is, therefore, none the less a revolutionary measure being introduced by stages. The fundamental differences between the British left- and right-wing parties over foreign policy between the wars were more subtle. They were violently felt and experienced and their existence was one of the contributory causes of the disasters of 1938 and 1939, but it is exceedingly difficult to define their causes in general terms. Perhaps one difference can be fairly suggested by quoting Mr. Ramsay Macdonald's statement at the fifth assembly of the League in 1924: "Our interests for peace are far greater than our interests in creating a machinery of defence; a machinery of defence is easy to create, but beware lest

in creating it you destroy the chances of peace." If that doctrine meant only that the object of a defence machinery is the preservation of peace, no one could have objected to it. But it was held to imply, and no doubt did, a belief to which not even the most Liberal-minded Conservative could ever subscribe, that the existence of a formula for negotiations and arbitration rendered national armaments superfluous. Another and equally fundamental difference lay in the attitude of the two parties to Russia, in particular, and to the revolution in general. Long before 1925 the British Government had abandoned all idea of intervening in Russia's internal affairs, but revolution *per se* represented to the Conservatives a dangerous solvent of international order and economic recovery, and they accordingly viewed Russia from the outset with much of the distrust with which the whole Western world views her to-day.

It is against the background of these fundamental differences of creed and temperament rather than under the influence of the more fashionable polemical views of the inherent vices of Conservatives or Labour-Socialists that we should consider the political history of the period from 1925 to our own times. January, 1925, marks fairly clearly the end of the immediate post-war confusion. By that date there was at least a marked improvement in the general political and economic situation in Europe. The reparations problem had been partially solved by the Dawes scheme; the German currency was on the way to being re-established (albeit at the cost of the ruin of the German middle classes for which the world was to pay very dearly); the eastern frontiers were at last more or less stabilised; a treaty had been signed with a stable government in Turkey; the French had withdrawn from the Ruhr which they had occupied on the plea of a default by the Germans over reparations in January, 1923 (during their occupation the mark had fallen to 15,000,000 to the £); there were faint signs of a revival of international trade. The debate at Geneva between the apostles of sanctions and the apostles of disarmament was, however, still in progress; the French were the champions of a new draft instrument, the Geneva protocol, which proposed in effect a system of guarantees, backed by sanctions, for the enforcement of the unchanged provisions of the different peace treaties; the British dominions, members of the League of Nations in their own right, refused to support such a system and Mr. Baldwin's government were thus forced, almost as soon as they had taken office, to decide against the protocol. Without some international guarantees the French would not disarm; without disarmament Germany's rearmament could not be indefinitely forbidden. So the problem presented itself to all parties in Britain in 1925.

The world was now, for the first time, face to face with the real defect of the 1918 settlement. The succession states to the Austro-Hungarian Empire were so economically weak and so strategically

defensible that a rearmed Germany would dominate the Central European plain. It was, however, plainly incompatible with the ideals of the League to keep Germany permanently in tutelage to the military forces of their late enemies. Mr. Baldwin and the new British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Austen Chamberlain, found an imagined solution in the Locarno Treaties whereby Belgium, France, and Germany were to be guaranteed against aggression from one another by Great Britain and Italy, and as a reward for such an engagement voluntarily entered into, Germany was to be admitted to the League of Nations and to join in the disarmament negotiations as a free and equal party. The Locarno Treaties were negotiated in London amid great rejoicing, but what was much more significant than the guarantees offered to France and Belgium (or that was really the sum of the matter) by Great Britain and Italy was the tacit refusal of either country to guarantee the other territorial provisions of the peace treaties. If there had been a general will to disarmament, Locarno might, indeed, have been a starting point of a return to peaceful conditions, but disarmament was, in fact, a futile conception on a continent dominated in the east by Russia. Germany, Italy, Poland, and Czechoslovakia were not going, in the circumstances, to disarm voluntarily and there was no machinery for coercion, nor any will to coerce. In Great Britain alone disarmament proceeded steadily, but this only served to increase the nervousness of France while exciting the hopes of the enemies of the treaties elsewhere. It would be wrong to condemn the Locarno Treaties. They created a far more friendly atmosphere in Western Europe and, had any statesman in the period been in a position to profit by it, history would doubtless note these treaties as a memorable step towards the re-establishment of peace. The diplomacy of the twenties and thirties was, however, as sterile and irrelevant as the violent controversies which it gave rise to and which still influence political tempers all over the world.

Mr. Baldwin's approach to the domestic problems of Great Britain was, fortunately, rather firmer than his handling of foreign policy. Having abandoned, as we have seen, protection and imperial preference he proceeded, very deliberately, to lay, with the assistance of Mr. Neville Chamberlain and Mr. Winston Churchill, the firm foundations of the welfare state. Time had, in 1925, ended the old differences which had given Britain for so long a rigid two-party system. What was in question, as the conservative party of those days saw it, was how the private enterprise system, necessary in its judgment to a non self-supporting country which can only live by selling its products at competitive prices in the world's markets, could be made acceptable in an admitted democracy. The answer, it seemed clear, was to be found by accepting as public responsibilities, and thus, in effect, first charge on private enterprise, full statutory provision for

old age, sickness, widowhood, and unemployment. The decision in 1926 to introduce widows' and contributory old age pensions was not a hurried remedy for an emergency, but a deliberate act of policy, and one from which there could be no withdrawal. Here was something permanent and revolutionary.

The State was here put forward as the normal paymaster to whom all were to look for maintenance in widowhood (which comes to the majority of women) and in old age, which comes to all. The State was no longer to be the occasional intervener in times of stress and strain and the reliever of dire poverty, but the habitual and actually compulsory channel to which, in many of the normal eventualities of life, all people without distinction of means, class, and occupation would look for financial assistance.

Unfortunately, the Acts dealing with widows' and old age pensions were also noteworthy in a less creditable way. They marked the low-water mark of post-war finance. These Acts made vast promises, and conferred on future generations burdens vastly greater than those which would be borne by the first beneficiaries from the scheme.

To this ambitious scheme were added Mr. Neville Chamberlain's important Housing Act, which in effect solved the housing shortage in the inter-war period, and his still more important Local Government Act of 1929, which paved the way for the final abolition of the Poor Law and for the creation in its place of the Public Assistance Board, which in the hey-day of Mr. Attlee's Socialist and full employment administration was still paying out over £60,000,000 a year to over 1,200,000 in the relief of destitution.

It is fair to say that, as a matter of history, the pattern of the social system under which we live to-day is the creation not of Mr. Attlee, nor even of Mr. Churchill, but of the 1925 Conservative administration. Whether the path on which they set our feet was the right one or no, we have been unable to leave it, and most subsequent legislation has been within the framework of the social legislation of the twenties and thirties.

In 1929 Mr. Baldwin's government went to the country and was decisively rejected by the new electorate which returned 287 Labour members, 261 Conservatives, and 59 Liberals.

It is generally said that the cause of the defeat was the failure of Mr. Baldwin and his lieutenants to solve the problem of unemployment. That is quite unhistorical. By 1929 there was no unemployment problem. There was the terrible problem of the distressed areas, created by the permanent shrinkage of demand for our textiles, shipbuilding, coal, and iron and steel. The problem which Mr. Baldwin so notably failed to solve was solved partly by time and partly by circumstance. Since 1945, governments have sought to remedy it by encouraging new industries in the affected areas. It was then a problem which could only be solved by the

igration of labour and by time. The young people moved out of the distressed areas; the older people in the course of time died. In 1929, however, there seemed to Mr. Baldwin to be no hope of a quick solution and he said so. It was Mr. Baldwin's candour, not his callousness, which lost him the election.

Mr. Ramsay Macdonald had nothing to offer in place of Mr. Baldwin's policy. He could, and did, spend more money, but the large anti-Socialist majority made it impossible to nationalize our industries, and it is merely unhistorical to suppose that the Socialist Government had any policy of its own to cure the sickness of the distressed areas or to support our export trade in face of the increasingly adverse conditions which marked the years 1929 to 1932. We shall pull through, said Mr. Baldwin rather ruefully, and lost the election. We shall go from strength to strength, said Ramsay Macdonald, and led the country into the public bankruptcy of 1931.

There is no mystery whatever about the origins or nature of this crisis as far as it concerns this country. It had nothing to do with reparations, war debts, or the maldistribution of gold. It was the direct result of a prolonged failure of British costs to follow the trend of world prices, and their failure was reflected in the over-valuation of the £ sterling. What the Socialists did between 1929 and 1931 was to place the last straws on the back of an already reeling camel. Directly political confidence in the integrity of British governmental finance weakened, the long-feared flight from the £ became a fact. The immediate causes of the crisis were the foolish loans to Germany, and Mr. Snowden's reckless budgeting in March 1930 and his still more improvident arrangements for 1931-2. These mistakes greatly intensified foreign anxiety and, by further weakening Government credit at home, led to the overhead costs of industry just at the time when world prices were near their worst.

It was now that the train of events was set in motion that ultimately led to the outbreak of the Second World War. In the early 1930's Britain was in the throes of a financial crisis. France was hopelessly divided and incapable of producing any stable government. Those who say that we had only to overthrow Hitler by military force in 1933 (when Germany left the League) to relieve Europe for ever from the threat of another world war, forget that relations between Italy and France were strained almost to breaking point, that we could not even get into Germany, let alone fight her, without French co-operation, and that public opinion in both countries was unprepared for war and disinclined to effort. Even, however, if the effort had been made and Hitler had been driven from office, the world would have continued to face the central problem of rewriting the peace treaties, or not rewriting them, in the same mood as before and not in the mood of 1938 or 1939. It was allied disarmament, not on rearmament, that such enthusiasm

as there was in those uneasy days was centred, and the peaceful gesture, not the mailed fist, was the only fashionable prescription for the world's ills.

In this spirit a provisional armament agreement was actually reached with Germany in 1932. The initiative had come from Dr. Brüning's tottering government. But Germany by then was on the verge of revolution. For the delays which wrecked any hope of a settlement of the armaments issue with Germany in 1930 and 1931 the blame must be laid chiefly on France, but there was a lack of statesmanship everywhere, for which no creed or party bears sole blame.

Early in 1932 the Disarmament Conference opened at Geneva. By that time Mr. Ramsay Macdonald had formed the first National Government. The conference opened to the accompaniment of the Japanese guns bombarding Shanghai. Though few realized it, the post-1918 peace years were over for ever. Two months later the Nazis, in the spring elections, gained control of Prussia.

Dr. Brüning, immediately he learned the results of the Prussian elections, hurried to Geneva with a concrete proposal for limited German rearmament. He secured the agreement of Great Britain, but the French representative, M. Tardieu, was not at Geneva; a general election was in progress in France. Chance, again, was playing the hand. When he was summoned to discuss the Geneva proposals, he was dissuaded by his ambassador in Berlin, who assured him that Dr. Brüning was about to fall from office and that a lasting and more favourable agreement could be secured from his successor. M. Tardieu fell into the trap. That was the end of the Weimar republic, and it sealed the fate of parliamentary democracy on the Continent for a generation. On January 30, 1933, Hitler became Chancellor of the German Reich.

The result was devastating for the Disarmament Conference, which became a public farce. The powerlessness of the League, in face of the divisions of the great powers, roused the dormant energies of Russia, Japan, and Germany to a realization of their opportunities. Russian penetration in Turkestan and Mongolia was quiet, and little notice was taken of it. If we had lost the Nelson touch, we had at least preserved his blind eye. The overt blow to the peace organization was struck by Japan in 1933, when she invaded Manchuria and refused to account to the League for her action. As usual, Great Britain had no policy.

China was the first victim of the fatal League doctrine of non-intervention; once the great powers disinterested themselves in her growing anarchy, Japanese intervention was inevitable. The attempt of the League to condition and limit it, after years of inaction, was doomed to failure. If the powers were too idle, too callous, or too poor to make that relatively small military effort that would have been necessary to save China from herself, it is folly to suppose that they would or could have dispatched the two

ion men who would have been necessary to challenge the
ngest military power in Asia.

he impotence of the League in this matter was quickly noted
France. It was obvious that the support of the League, even
an unanimous verdict of the League Council, was at best a mere
omatic asset. It provided no element of security against an
breach of the Versailles Treaty of Germany. The immediate
equence was the breakdown of the Disarmament Conference
the withdrawal of Germany from the League.

needed only one more blow to the League's prestige in Europe
re Germany formally fulfilled France's expectations and
unced the Versailles Treaty openly and without even the
ality of consultation. This last blow was provided by the
its of the Saar Plebiscite on January 17, 1935.

ie population of the Saar was of mixed race, enjoying free
tutions. It had, by a stroke of good fortune, escaped the
strous political tyrannies which a ruthless political gangster
imposing on Germany. They were also enjoying marked
omic advantages under the League's *régime*. British, Swedish,
Italian officials supervised the polling stations, and the polling
and stations were so arranged that by no human possibility
l it become known how towns, districts, or individuals had
d. The result was a vote for National Socialism so over-
ming that it actually exceeded the majority which Hitler had
ined in Germany under conditions of his own choosing, on the
of disarmament, on which his opponents felt almost as
gly as his supporters. We had intervened at last in the
pean theatre, only to mount guard over the formal and
asiastic obsequies of the system to which we had pinned
aith.

r the second time since 1918—the first time had been at
ak—the statesmen of the democracies learned that men of
g will and ruthless determination will triumph over the best
tions of irresolute committee men.

e European situation deteriorated rapidly after the Saar
scite and Hitler's denunciation of the disarmament clauses
e Versailles Treaty in the spring of 1935. Nevertheless, the
sh Government, through Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and Sir John
n, made a last effort to ride the storm. Immediately after
r's introduction of conscription, they created the so-called
a Front. Mr. Ramsay Macdonald was harking back to his
ial policy and determined on a last effort to keep Italy by the
of Great Britain and France. With a friendly Italian Army
e Brenner, Germany's designs on Austria could be checked,
checkmated. The enigmatic M. Laval in France was of the
mind, and was prepared at the eleventh hour (or so it was
ed) to make substantial concessions to Italy. The Stresa
7 collapsed on the issue of Abyssinia. The Franco-Italian

Agreement was signed but not ratified. The Stresa agreement between Great Britain, Italy, and France became a dead letter.

We shall probably never know how it came about that no reference was made to Abyssinia at the Stresa meeting between Mussolini, Mr. Ramsay Macdonald, and Sir John Simon. The Italians had brought their colonial experts to discuss the matter, which was not only ripe for discussion but capable of settlement. The question became later impossible of settlement by reason of the Italian aggression, but in its origin and essence it was not so. The methods of the Government at Addis Ababa at that date had been denounced much more severely by the British than by the Italians. Further, there had been trouble for some years on the Sudan-Abyssinia frontier as well as on the Eritrea border. Finally, the ultimate need for some agreement between Great Britain, Italy, and Egypt on the future of Abyssinia had been recognized as long ago as 1906, when Italy's special interests in the region had been accepted by Britain and France in one of the secret clauses of the agreements made at Algeciras.

The year 1935 was the prelude to revolution. The next year saw the first Popular Front Government in France and the Spanish Civil War, while the pro-English, pro-League sentiment in Italy was overwhelmed by the patriotic excitements which accompanied the Abyssinian campaign. The British Government had, indeed, seen late and dimly the writing on the wall, and in March 1935 (three days before Hitler reintroduced conscription) they had issued the first feeble call to the nation to rearm. Unfortunately for the peace of the world, the faint voice of the first White Paper on rearmament had been drowned by the strident noise of the Peace Ballot, which in the summer of 1935 disclosed, or appeared to disclose, an immense majority in Great Britain in favour of the League policy just when the League prestige in Europe was at its lowest.

Only from Great Britain and France was there any effective withholding of supplies. On these two powers fell the whole burden of Italy's hostility. Soon after the general election of October, 1935, we tried to repair the greatest diplomatic blunder committed by this country since the days of James I by formulating proposals with France for a compromise settlement. The French Government was tottering to its fall, but Mr. Baldwin's government had just received a fresh and clear mandate from the electorate and decided, for once, to take a bold initiative. The result was the famous Hoare-Laval proposal. This proposal, if put forward privately, might have been acceptable to both belligerents, would have given Italy a great diplomatic success but would have preserved a measure of sovereignty to the Abyssinians. Instead, it was made in good faith by a government determined above all to save the face of the League. The plan was therefore published to the world, and at once condemned by the left-wing press in France

the whole of the press in Great Britain and the United States. Most of the neutrals were sceptical; Russia was frankly hostile. The plan was withdrawn in a panic, almost before it had been started by both belligerents on very different grounds. Italy, in the disunion of the League forces the chance of a complete victory. Abyssinia was so utterly misled by the outcry against concessions proposed to be given to Italy as to think that the world would, if need be, rally actively to her side. Mr. Baldwin lost his nerve; Sir Samuel Hoare resigned; Haile Selassie lost his throne and the world drifted on to the catastrophe which was, humanly speaking, unavoidable.

While Great Britain was licking her wounds, Hitler, on March 7, 1938, staged the second of his coups and marched into the Rhineland.

At this, if *Realpolitik* had been our game, was the moment for firm action against Germany. Germany's bluff was audacious. Not even the German General Staff expected it to succeed. But France was weak and irresolute and British public opinion in a state of confusion. Germany was allowed to secure her flank and so pave the way for the annexation of Austria.

The same fatal confusion of opinion was to paralyse our diplomacy over Austria and over the Sudeten Germans in Czechoslovakia.

In March, 1938, while the Spanish Civil War was at its height, relations between Britain, France, and Russia were very strained, Hitler invaded Austria.

His stroke was the direct consequence of the British Government's ineffective support of Abyssinia and the French Government's futile support of the revolutionary side in the Spanish Civil War. Hitler saw Great Britain involved for the hundredth time in a feeble policy of reluctant acquiescence in illegalities which were open as to be flagrant. The annexation of Austria would only add another illegality, and we should, he argued, undoubtedly succumb in that also.

The significance of the Austrian *coup* was military, not political. In annexing Austria Hitler turned the line of the Czechoslovakian defences. The unique military inexperience of the British and French political leaders at that time was perhaps responsible for our failure to appreciate this, and when the Czechoslovakian crisis developed almost immediately afterwards, hardly any one seemed aware that the much-vaunted Czechoslovakian defences, after the annexation of Austria, about as much use as the Maginot Line after the collapse of the front in northern France.

In May, 1937, Mr. Baldwin had resigned, and had been succeeded by Mr. Neville Chamberlain. Mr. Baldwin bequeathed to his successor a divided country, a navy, army, and air force wholly inadequate to our responsibilities, and a prestige in Europe vastly diminished by diplomatic defeats. George VI., second son of

George V., was now king: his elder brother had earlier succeeded to the throne as Edward VIII. on George V.'s death in January, 1936. He abdicated later the same year, to marry Mrs. Ernest Simpson, an American whose two previous marriages had ended in divorce, and he then took the title of Duke of Windsor.

Only one major change in domestic policy had marked the six years of the Macdonald-Baldwin national governments, but that was a revolutionary one. A revenue tariff had been introduced immediately following on the general election of 1931, but in 1932, following on the Ottawa Conference, a complex system of imperial preference was introduced, and at the same time a great measure of protection was afforded to British agriculture by a wide variety of measures, including not only protective duties, but quotas, subsidies, controlled marketing, and guaranteed prices. These decisions marked a definite step on the road to a planned economy. They reflected the first realization that the old Liberal economic order could not survive unchanged in a world where political considerations were driving nation after nation towards self-sufficiency, buttressed by bilateral trade agreements, and where, simultaneously, the State was expected to guarantee to all its citizens minimum standards of living. The now much less influential Liberal party remained unconverted either to planning or to tariffs, but after 1932 the tariff issue ceased to be controversial among the people at large, and the fact that the Liberals henceforward were committed to reversing the only wholly successful measures introduced by any party since 1929, condemned the Liberal party to progressive and rapid decline as a political force until the late 1950's.

The effect of the protective tariff, the empire preferences, and the measures for the relief of British agriculture were marked; unemployment had fallen to the 1929 figure; wages and savings had risen and the cost of living fallen; industrial production and housing had substantially increased.

In the course of this slow upward climb from bankruptcy to solvency, but when progress was still slow and there was a long way to go, there had been the general election of 1935, when, according to his own subsequent admission, Mr. Baldwin did not tell the full truth to the country about the need for rearmament and when, perhaps for that very reason, he obtained a surprisingly large majority. It remains doubtful whether Mr. Baldwin's decision had any real effect on the subsequent situation. Had he asked for a mandate for rearmament on a great scale he would probably have lost the election, but had he won it, it is unlikely that war could have been averted. The trouble with Mr. Ramsay Macdonald and Mr. Baldwin was not that their foreign policy was wrong but that they had no policy. Precisely the same indictment lies against that of Mr. Baldwin's opponents both on the right and on the left. Our foreign policy failed in the thirties for precisely

same reason that it had failed in the twenties. We never made our minds what it was we wanted and therefore we never prepared ourselves to get it.

With the advent of Mr. Neville Chamberlain to power in 1937 drift towards war continued. Mr. Chamberlain was a man of greater decision of character than Mr. Baldwin, but he had, at the start, a hopeless hand to play, and he was a man who was tragically disinclined to take advice. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to suppose that there were many real chances still open which were lost. These chances had been lost at Versailles, at Locarno in 1925, and at Stresa, if we are thinking of diplomatic opportunities, and in 1933 and 1936, if we are thinking of opportunities for an easy military victory.

Although Mr. Chamberlain is primarily remembered as a peacemaker, British rearmament proceeded on an ever-increasing scale during his first year of office; income-tax was raised to provide necessary revenues. At last the British public was taking seriously the danger about which Winston Churchill had been warning it, all in vain, for several years past. But the German peace armament continued to draw ahead of the British effort. The threats to world peace grew rapidly more imminent and more serious in 1938, and the year was marked by successive crises. On one occasion, though war was averted, its inevitability became apparent. Hitler assumed command of all the armed forces of the Reich, and clearly indicated that henceforth Germany would rely on her military strength to solve her "grievances."

The arrogant claims of the German Government to the Czech Sudetenlands, in September, 1938, seemed bound to trigger off world conflict, for France had guaranteed Czech integrity, and, as Britain had pledged for the ultimate security of France, she too was immediately involved. Chamberlain, now 70 years of age, resolved to make an unprecedented personal effort to avert the catastrophe. Leaving by air for the first time in his life, he visited Hitler at Berchtesgaden, and followed this up by two further flights to London to secure the acceptance of a plan agreed upon with Hitler, which, in effect, forced Czechoslovakia to strip herself of fortified frontier-territories and rendered her defenceless, in the eyes of the world, in the cause of world peace. At the Munich Conference, Mr. Chamberlain signed with Hitler a declaration pledging their two countries to seek peaceful means of settling any future differences between them. Mr. Chamberlain sincerely believed that he had brought back peace in our time; and he received a tumultuous welcome when he returned to England. But most informed observers, in Britain and elsewhere, justifiably regarded the Munich transaction on Hitler's part as worthless and hypocritical and the Munich agreement as a shameful betrayal of Czechoslovakia.

Mr. Chamberlain clung to his course of substituting the method of discussion for that of force even when Hitler overran the rest of

Czechoslovakia, but on March 31, 1939, in the face of rumours of German designs on Poland, he announced that Britain would support Poland if the latter were attacked. When Italy subsequently occupied Albania, he declared that Britain would support Rumania and Greece, should their sovereignty be threatened. These pledges marked the end of "appeasement"—a policy which had had overwhelming popular support at the time but which has since been bitterly criticized by every shade of political opinion. The government introduced limited conscription. In July, 1939, the German threat to Danzig and the flagrant violations of Polish rights there made it obvious that conflict was imminent. The nation had, however, now become thoroughly inured to the prospect of war, and it was recognized that Nazi methods were incompatible with any settled order in Europe. Germany invaded Poland on September 1, 1939; on September 3, Britain and France declared war on her.

The principal military and political events of the Second World War are listed chronologically in the next section. The Britain which emerged from the struggle in 1945 was to be very different from the Britain of 1939. As had been the case twenty-five years earlier, war considerably accelerated basic social changes which had been taking place very gradually during the years of peace: but this time the changes were, in some ways, even more radical in nature. By 1939 Britain had fully accepted the idea of the State's ultimate responsibility towards its less fortunate members: government policy on pensions, unemployment benefits, and housing indicated this. Despite the hardships of the depression, and considerable remaining inequalities of wealth and opportunity between different sections of the population, class distinctions were already far weaker than they had been at the end of the First World War, and the chances of individual advancement on merit much greater. During the Second World War, economic pressures swung the wages structure sharply in favour of the working class as a whole, while State intervention became an accepted part of the life of every member of the community, and not merely of the unfortunate: and by 1945 the principle of the "Welfare State" was acknowledged, in practice at least, by both major British political parties.

SECTION III.—THE SECOND WORLD WAR, 1939–1945

authorities.—Sir Winston Churchill, "The Second World War" (1948, 5); Sir W. M. James, "The British Navies in the Second World War" (1948); D. Richards and H. St. G. Saunders, "A Preliminary History of the Royal Air Force," 2 vols. (1949).]

39. Germany invades Poland, 1 Sept.; Britain, New Zealand, Australia, and France declare war on Germany, 3 Sept.; Canada and S. Africa declare war: Gen. Smuts becomes Premier of S. Africa, 4 Sept.; Russia invades Poland, 17 Sept.; Poland partitioned between Germany and Russia, 28 Sept.; *Royal Oak* sunk in Scapa Flow, 14 Oct.; Anglo-Turkish pact, 19 Oct.; U.S.A. "Cash and Carry Act" repeals the arms embargo, 4 Nov.; Russia invades Finland, 30 Nov.; b. of the River Plate, 13 Dec.; *Admiral Graf Spee* scuttled, 17 Dec.

40. Russo-Finnish Peace, 12 Mar.; Reynaud French Premier, 20 Mar.; Germans attack Denmark and Norway, 9 April; Germans invade the Low Countries, 10 May; Churchill forms coalition govt., 10 May; Dutch army surrenders and German victory at Sedan, 15 May; Belgian army surrenders, 28 May; Dunkirk evacuation, 30 May–3 June; British evacuate Norway and Italy declares war on Allies, 10 June; Spain seizes Tangier and Germans enter Paris, 14 June; French reject British offer of union and Pétain becomes Premier, 16 June; French surrender, 22 June; Russians seize Bessarabia from Rumania, 28 June; Rumania denounces Anglo-French guarantee, 1 July; British disable the French fleet in N. Africa at Oran, 3 July; Italians invade the Sudan, 4 July; Vichy breaks off relations with Britain, 5 July; Britain closes Burma road, 18 July; Lithuania annexed by U.S.S.R., 3 Aug.; Italians invade British Somaliland, 4 Aug.; U.S.S.R. annexes Estonia and Latvia, 5 Aug.; b. of Britain, 8 Aug.–6 Sept.; Vienna award dismembers Rumania, 30 Aug.; British obtain 50 destroyers from U.S.A. in return for bases in W. Indies, 2 Sept.; beginning of the London blitz, 7–8 Sept.; Italians invade Egypt, 13 Sept.; British attack on Dakar fails, 25 Sept.; the "New Order" Pact (Germany, Italy, Japan), 27 Sept.; Germans occupy Rumania, 7 Oct.; Italy attacks Greece, 28 Oct.; Italian fleet severely damaged by British air attack at Taranto, 11 Nov.; blitz on Coventry, 14 Nov.; Wavell opens victorious offensive against Italians in N. Africa, 8 Dec. (till 8 Feb., 1941).

41. Italian forces placed under German control, 20 Jan.; Germans occupy Bulgaria, 9 Feb.; Britain breaks off relations with Rumania, 10 Feb.; British capture Mogadishu, 26 Feb.; Bulgaria joins Axis, 1 Mar.; U.S.A. Lend-Lease Act becomes law, 11 Mar.; Rommel's counter-attack in Libya begins, 24 Mar.; Gen. Simovic overthrows pro-Axis govt. in Yugoslavia,

27 Mar.; British naval victory over Italians at C. Matapan, 28 Mar.; Rashid Ali's pro-Axis revolt in Iraq, 3 April; British capture Addis Ababa, 5 April; Germans invade Yugoslavia and Greece, 6 April; Germans capture Sollum, 26 April; Athens, 27 April; Hess flies to Scotland, 10 May; Italians surrender at Amba Alagi, 19 May; German conquest of Crete, 19 May-1 June; H.M.S. *Hood* sunk, 24 May; *Bismarck* sunk, 27 May; British and French occupy Syria, 8 June-14 July; Germany invades U.S.S.R., 22 June; U.S.A. occupies Iceland, 7 July; British and Russians occupy Persia, 25 Aug.-1 Sept.; Reza, Shah of Persia, forced to abdicate, 16 Sept.; Germans reach Leningrad, 4 Sept.; capture Kiev, 19 Sept.; second British offensive in Libya, 18 Nov.; final Italian surrender in Ethiopia at Gondar, 27 Nov.; Three-Power Conference at Moscow, 29 Nov.; Japanese attack Pearl Harbour, 7 Dec.; Japanese occupy Siam and invade Malaya, 8 Dec.; H.M.S.s *Prince of Wales* and *Repulse* sunk, 10 Dec.; Japanese take Guam and Axis declare war on U.S.A., 11 Dec.; Hitler takes immediate command of German army, 19 Dec.; Japanese take Wake I., 23 Dec.; Hong Kong, 25 Dec.

1942. United Nations Pact at Washington, 1 Jan.; Japanese take Manila, 2 Jan.; Japanese naval victory in Macassar Straits, 23-25 Jan.; Japanese invade Burma, 8 Feb.; capture Singapore, 15 Feb.; Rangoon, 9 Mar.; Java, 10 Mar.; American raid on Tokio, 18 April; fall of Corregidor, 6 May; Japanese naval victory in the Coral Sea, 7-11 May; second German offensive in Libya opens, 12 May; first 1,000-bomber raid (on Cologne) 30 May; b. of Midway, 3-6 June; Japanese attack Aleutians, 3 June; Gen. Eisenhower C.-in-C. U.S. forces European theatre, 25 May; Germans reach El Alamein, 1 July; Germans take Sebastopol, 2 July; Americans attack Guadalcanal, 7 Aug.; British raid on Dieppe, 14 Aug.; Germans take Stalingrad, 5 Sept.; Russian counter-offensive at Stalingrad begins, 27 Sept.; British victory at Alamein, 23 Oct.-3 Nov.; allied landing in N. Africa, 8 Nov.; Germans occupy Vichy France, 11-12 Nov.; French fleet scuttled at Toulon, 27 Nov.; Germans driven from Agheila, 13 Dec.; Russian victory at Kotelnikovo, 29 Dec.

1943. Casablanca Conference, 14-26 Jan.; British take Tripoli, 23 Jan.; Russians take Voronezh, 25 Jan.; final German surrender in Stalingrad, 2 Feb.; Gen. Eisenhower allied C.-in-C. N. Africa, 6 Feb.; Russians take Kursk, 8 Feb.; Americans finally clear Guadalcanal, 9 Feb.; b. of the Bismarck Sea, 1-3 Mar.; b. of the Mareth, 21-29 Mar.; Allies take Tunis, 7 May; Axis surrender in N. Africa, 13 May; Allies take Pantelleria, 11 June; Allies conquer Sicily, 9 July-7 Aug.; Mussolini resigns, 25 July; Russians take Orel, 4 Aug.; Kharkov, 23 Aug.; Mountbatten becomes allied C.-in-C. S.E.

Asia, 25 Aug.; Allies land in Italy and Italy surrenders, 3 Sept.; allied landing at Salerno, 9 Sept.; Russians take Bryansk, 17 Sept.; Smolensk, 25 Sept.; Kiev, 6 Nov.; Americans capture Tarawa, 21–25 Nov.; Cairo Conference, 22–26 Nov.; Teheran Conference, 26 Nov.–2 Dec.; U.S.A. and Britain give aid to Tito, 20 Dec.

944. Ciano executed, 11 Jan.; Russian offensive in Leningrad area begins, 15 Jan.; allied landings at Nettuno and Anzio, 22 Jan.; Americans capture Kwajalein, 1–6 Feb.; b. of Cassino, 1 Feb.–18 May; Japanese defeat in Manipur, 13 Mar.–30 June; Russians reach Polish and Rumanian frontiers, 2 April; capture Sebastopol, 9 May; Allies enter Rome, 4 June; allied landings in Normandy, 6 June; flying bomb attacks on London begin, 15 June; break-through at St. Lô, 27 July; Polish rising in Warsaw begins, 1 Aug.; b. of the Falaise gap, 7–23 Aug.; allied landings in S. of France, 15 Aug.; Allies capture Paris, 25 Aug.; Brussels, 3 Sept.; Americans take Palau Is., 15 Sept.–13 Oct.; Russians invade Hungary, 6 Oct.; b. of Arnhem, 17–26 Oct.; decisive Japanese naval defeat in Philippine Sea, 23–25 Oct.; armistice with Bulgaria, 28 Oct.; British land on Walcheren, 1 Nov.; last German offensive in the Ardennes, 16–22 Dec.; Hungary changes sides, 30 Dec.

945. Russians take Warsaw, 11 Jan.; Russians take Budapest, 13 Feb.; Turkey declares war on Germany and Japan, 23 Feb.; Americans cross the Rhine at Remagen, 7 Mar.; Russians denounce the neutrality pact with Japan, 5 April; Pres. Roosevelt dies, 12 April; Russians occupy Vienna, 13 April, and reach Berlin, 21 April; Russians and Americans meet near Torgau, 26 April; Mussolini shot, and German plenipotentiaries in Italy sign terms of surrender, 29 April; Berlin surrenders and armistice in Italy effective, 2 May; German forces in N.W. Europe surrender, 5 May; all German forces surrender, 7 May; Americans capture Okinawa, 21 June; atomic bomb on Hiroshima, 6 Aug.; Russia attacks Japan, 8 Aug.; atomic bomb on Nagasaki, 9 Aug.; Japan surrenders, 14 Aug.; Japanese forces in China surrender, 9 Sept.; in S.E. Asia, 12 Sept.

SECTION IV.—1945–1960

THE end of the Second World War it soon became evident that Britain had undergone a peaceful social revolution during the preceding six years. In addition, her position as a world power had changed fundamentally. In 1940 Britain had “stood alone” in the midst of a Germany which effectively dominated the

rest of Europe. After 1945 she recognized her interdependence with the United States of America and with the non-Communist nations on the Continent in any future struggle, and this recognition was to be expressed in her membership of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, established in 1948, whose members co-operated in their joint defence. The Britain of 1945 was a debtor-nation, impoverished by war, and bereft of many of her former sources of colonial wealth; yet in her struggle to regain her solvency and her place as one of the great trading nations of the world, she still placed stringent conditions on the economic links she was prepared to forge with Europe. The year 1959 thus saw the emergence of two economic blocs in Western Europe—the “Inner Six” and the “Outer Seven”: the first, dominated by Gaullist France and Adenauer's Federal Germany; the second by Britain. This fact was not without potential dangers for the future. The military and material leadership of the West had passed to the United States of America. Britain's influence diminished in the Middle East, in particular; rising Arab nationalism was “anti-Imperialist,” and the Suez fiasco in 1956 and the republican *coup* in Iraq in 1958 really marked the end of Britain's effective authority in the area. Conversely, British policy towards what had been her pre-1939 Empire was generally enlightened and progressive: India, Pakistan, and Ceylon became self-governing dominions within the Commonwealth in 1946, and Malaya and Ghana in 1958, and all maintained close and affectionate relations with Britain. Considerable efforts were made to achieve constitutional progress and racial harmony in Britain's other African territories, though here success was not uniform: in 1960, Mr. Macmillan, on a visit to South Africa, declared Britain unable to accept Nationalist South Africa's policy of *apartheid*.

After 1945 the European countries liberated from Germany by the Soviet armies rapidly succumbed to Communism. The “iron curtain” of the Red Army divided Communist from non-Communist Europe, and split Germany into two ideologically opposed states. Relations between East and West deteriorated rapidly. The episode of the “Berlin blockade” in 1948 seemed, for a time, on the verge of leading to open hostilities; but the uneasy state of “cold war” remained, tension lessening a little after Stalin's death in 1953, increasing in 1956 after the Russians' bloody suppression of an anti-Communist revolution in Hungary, and subsequently subsiding in face of Mr. Khrushchev's apparent willingness to discuss some at least of the issues at stake with the United States and Britain. Throughout the period, the tense world situation forced Britain to maintain extremely heavy expenditure on defence, and she also pursued her own experiments in the field of nuclear warfare. In the Far East the rise of Communist China first became really obvious to Western eyes in 1950, when the Korean war broke out. America took the initiative in countering Communist aggression in South Korea with armed force, and Britain supported

ending troops to join the United Nations' army there. Unlike United States, however, Britain recognized the Communist as the legal government of China.

1945 a General Election resulted in a sweeping Labour victory: the first time, a British Labour government had a clear working majority. Labour's proposed programme of social reform had widely attracted large numbers of uncommitted young voters. Clement Attlee became Prime Minister, and the next five years saw the enactment of a vast amount of social legislation and nationalization. The previous government had already passed an important Education Act (1944): the Labour Government carried through sweeping legislation dealing, among other things, with social insurance and legal aid, and set up the National Health Service. During his period of office, coal-mines, railways, gas and electricity undertakings, air-lines, road haulage, and iron and steel were nationalized, the power of the House of Lords further curtailed. This programme involved heavy taxation, and the government's belief in a "managed economy" was expressed in numerous controls, notably in such spheres as building, etc. The continuing austerity of British life, several years after the end of the war, for which government policy was at least partially responsible, soon began to evoke a popular discontent. At the General Election in 1950 the Labour majority was cut from 186 to 8; the following year, there was a serious economic crisis, and Attlee again went to the country. The result was a Conservative victory, and Winston Churchill once again became Prime Minister. The Conservatives accepted most of the predecessors' legislation, but repealed the Acts nationalizing iron and steel and road transport. They also abolished many of the controls used by Labour.

The sudden death of George VI. in 1952 brought to the throne the Queen-Regnant Britain had had for more than half a century. The coronation of Queen Elizabeth II. took place with full ceremony in 1953. By 1955 "austerity" Britain had largely disappeared. The long hard times had ended, industry was booming, and the housing shortage, acute since 1945, was easing. Churchill, now over eighty years of age, resigned, to be succeeded as Premier by Anthony Eden, and in the General Election that followed the Conservatives regained their majority. But by 1956 the situation was less stable. Unemployment began to rise: inflationary pressures reasserted themselves. In July, Britain relinquished her Suez Canal bases. In October, Franco-British intervention in an armed dispute between Israel and Egypt, in the form of a military landing at Port Said, caused a serious, though only temporary, rift between Britain and the United States, and damaged British prestige immeasurably throughout the Middle East. In Britain itself, public opinion was widely divided on the issue. Early in 1957 Eden resigned and passed from politics for health reasons, and Harold Macmillan became Prime Minister. During the year the Bank Rate was raised

to 7 per cent (the highest since 1920). The Rent Act freed large numbers of properties from long-standing rent restrictions, and in passing this measure the government incurred considerable unpopularity. However, by the time the next General Election took place, in 1959, economic stability had been regained. The country as a whole was prosperous; save in a few particular industries (e.g. cotton) unemployment had fallen; consumer goods were plentiful. Once again the Conservatives returned to power, with a majority still bigger than before. Never before had a British political party had such a succession of election victories, with its majority progressively increasing from Parliament to Parliament.

This period of British history has already been criticized in some quarters for its apparently overriding preoccupation with material concerns. Certainly it was a period in which high wages, scientific progress, and industrial expansion combined to make many of the material perquisites of modern civilization—television sets, cars, refrigerators, holidays abroad, etc.—available to vastly larger sections of the population than ever before. Poverty had not been eliminated, but its boundaries had shrunk drastically. The Labour party in 1959 became suddenly aware that many people whom it had regarded as its traditional supporters now had what might be termed a “middle-class” standard of living, and that their political attitude had modified accordingly. It was forced to set about a reappraisal of its own ideas on basic issues. In addition, the Trade Union movement was becoming discredited in the eyes of many citizens owing to its failure to control its more extreme members. The “unofficial strike” was a familiar feature of the domestic scene 1945–60. Many observers noted a decline in the status of the individual *per se*: public and private monopolies, the “closed shop” policy of some of the unions, and, above all, the tremendous increase in the State’s authority to intervene in the affairs of all its citizens tended to restrict the individual’s freedom. This tendency was not confined to Britain: it existed throughout the Western world, and the “existentialist” literature of post-war France and the “angry young man” of English letters of the 1950’s can be interpreted as literary expressions of resentment against it. On the other hand, charity was dispensed on a larger scale than ever before, albeit by the State machine, while catastrophes such as the disastrous coastal floods of 1953 and the Hungarian revolution of 1956 evoked a most generous financial reaction from all sections of the British public. However, despite the social benefits provided by the Welfare State, despite the increasing opportunities for leisure produced by improved health, shorter working hours, and higher wages, and despite the greater educational opportunities available to all, moral problems remained, and even grew more pressing. The decline in religious observance, evident since the end of the First World War, showed few concrete signs of being arrested. A consistently high

of divorce and crime, the prevalence of prostitution in the big , sporadic outbreaks of intolerance towards racial minorities, an acknowledged "teen-age problem" were some of the signs indicated that material progress was ultimately of little value right spiritual and moral bases were missing.

STATE CENTRAL LIBRARY
WEST BENGAL
CALCUTTA

INDEX

- of Fleury, in England, 53
 , Archbishop, his intolerance, 11
 conoclasm, 479
 d, his lectures attended by Englishmen, 125
 omby, General, his victory; see Battles
 ers; see Petitioners and horrors
 ame, loss of, 218
 defence of; see Smith (Sir dney)
 f Parliament; see Statutes
 zton becomes Prime Minister, 57
 d, of Bath, 80
 services to the universities, 13, 124
 ctors, council of, 529
 , Earl of Mercia, exile of, 61
 , comes to the throne, 43
 es back the Danes, 44, 45
 es peace, 45
 objects, 46
 government, 45, 46
 itary work, 46, 47
 igs of, compiled in Henry the cond's time, 110
 , Edmund Ironside's brother, tacks England, 61
 yes torn out by Harold, 16
 leader of the Jutes, 10
 of Deira, 17
 ald, of Mercia, 35, 36
 epulse from Wessex, 39
 erht, his rule in Kent, 17
 onversion, 18
 t of his death, 20
 laed, Ælfred's daughter, arries Æthelred, 45
 of Mercia, 49
 uers the five boroughs, 49
 es Tamworth and Stafford, 49
 rith, founds the kingdom of orthumberland, 15
 acres monks of Bangor, 15, 16
 t of his victories, 16
 t of his death, 17
 ed, king of Mercia, 34
 ed, son of Æthelwulf, 43
 as peace of Nottingham, 43
 eath, 43
 ed, Alfred's son-in-law, 45
 ictories over Danes, 48
 ed, the Unready, buys peace m Danes, 55
 's massacre of St. Brice's day, Æthelred, the Unready, driven to Normandy, 56
 Æthelstan, conquers West Wales, 49
 his victory at Brunanburgh, 50
 Æthelthryth, founds Ely Abbey, 31
 Æthelwold, his school at Abingdon, 53
 bishop of Winchester, 52
 Æthelwulf, king of Wessex, 42
 struggle with Danes, 42
 Affirmation Act (1888), 829
 permitted to Quakers, etc., 805
 Agrarian Revolution, 792-794
 Agricola, Julius; see Britain, Roman conquest of
 Agriculture, department of (Ireland), 835
 Aidan, sent to Northumbria as a missionary, 22
 his blessing on Oswald, 22, 23
 his miracle against Penda, 23
 Cuthbert's vision of him, 25
 effect of his work, 28
 Aix-la-Chapelle, peace of, 701
 Albemarle, Stephen of, insurrection in his favour, 83
 Albigenes, 138, 139
 Alewine or Aleuin, as an authority, 33
 his assistance to Bede, 38
 averts war between Offa and Charles, 40
 Aldgate, surrendered by Cnihtenagild, 89
 Alexander, First of Russia, allies himself with Napoleon, 771
 Alfred; see Ælfred
 Alfune builds St Giles's in twelfth century, 89
 Allen driven from Oxford by Elizabeth, 385
 Alleyne, author of "Alarm to the Unconverted," 591
 his death, 591
 Alliance, Austro-Spanish, 691 *n.*
 the Triple; see Temple
 Alva, his appearance in Flanders, 367
 the revolt against, 389
 America, discovery of, 286
 (United States of), rise of, 713-715
 attitude of George the Third towards, 727; see also Massachusetts, Virginia, Boston, Washington
 congress of, in 1775, 729
 Declaration of Independence, 730
 final recognition of its independence, 735
 effect of it, 736, 737
 alliance with France, 747

America, alliance with Napoleon, 775, 780
 civil war and its effects, 790
 Amiens, mise of; *see* Lewis the Ninth
 peace of, 767, 768
 Anderida, siege of, 10
 Andredswold, 10
 Danish position there, 48
 Andrewes, bishop, his declaration
 about James the First, 471
 Anglesey, conquered by Eadwine, 19
 Anjou, the line of, its character,
 91, 92
 Anlaf, 48 *n.*
 Anne deserts her father, 643
 influence on her of Duchess of
 Marlborough; *see* Marlborough,
 Duchess of
 recalled by William, 666
 her accession and policy, 666, 667
 her assent to the Act of Union
 with Scotland, 673
 her Toryism, 674
 Anselm, becomes Prior of Bec, 67
 his works, 67, 68
 Archbishop of Canterbury, 83
 struggle against William Rufus, 84
 share in the marriage of Henry, 85
 his recall by Henry, 85
 supports Henry against Robert, 88
 his effect on our literature, 109
 Anti-Corn Law League Association,
 812
 Archery, English, Edward the First's
 use of it, 171
 Architecture, impulse given to, by
 the Jews, 80
 Arcot, defence of, 708
 Argyle, Earl of, his relations with
 Charles the First, 505
 his struggle with Montrose, 521
 his execution, 598
 Argyle, Earl of, in James the
 Second's time, his condemna-
 tion, 627
 his insurrection, *ib.*
 his execution, *ib.*
 Arkwright, his invention of spinning-
 machine, 742
 its effects, 777
 Arlington, Lord, his dislike of France,
 600
 his part in the Triple Alliance, 602
 share in the Treaty of Dover, 603
 his advice about the Test Act, 604
 Ariotta, William the Conqueror's
 mother, 68
 Armada, the Spanish, 394-397
 new one threatened by Philip, 414
 Armagh, University of, 21
 Army plot to free Strafford, 504
 reform, 822
 Arnold, General, his attack on
 Canada, 730
 Array, commissions of, 511, 512 *n.*
 Arthur, of Brittany, taken prisoner
 and murdered by John, 107
 Arthur, of England, "dreams of,"
 a romance, 111

Arthur, of England, his tomb; *see*
 Glastonbury
 romances about, 111
 Ascham, his view of the effect of
 Italian literature on England, 377
 Ascue, Anne, burnt, 337
 Ashley, Lord, opposes the Act of
 Uniformity, 588
 defends Charles's proposal to dis-
 pense with it, 590
 opposes the Five Mile Act, 601
 his dislike of France, and support
 of Protestantism, 601
 his attitude towards Holland, 604;
see also Cooper, Shaftesbury
 Asquith, Mr., prime minister, 837
 Asser, the friend of Alfred, 46
 Assize of Arms, 102
 Assize of Clarendon; *see* Clarendon
 Astley, Sir Jacob, his view of the
 battle of Stow, 523
 Athelney, Alfred at, 44
 Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester, his
 removal from his bishopric, 684
 Attlee, Clement (later Earl), 865
 Aubrey, his account of Hobbes, 581
 Augsburg, peace of, 646
 Augustine, mission of, 17
 lands in Kent, 17
 his work, 18
 BACON, Roger, studied under Rabbis,
 83, 133
 his story, 129, 131
 his "Opus Majus," 131, 132
 death and subsequent fame, 132
 why allowed books, 141
 his rank as a schoolman, 141
 Bacon, Francis, his view of the friar,
 141
 a type of the new literature, 384,
 398
 his opinion of the Brownists, 524
 his career, 571, 576
 Badde, John, burnt as a heretic, 250
 Bada, his story of the Frisian slave-
 dealer, 13
 effect of his Latin History, 18
 his story of the sparrow, 20
 its significance, 27
 his career, 36, 37
 account of his Ecclesiastica
 History, 36, 37
 his death, 37
 letter to Archbishop Egbert, 38
 History translated by Alfred, 47
 rediscovered by Layamon, 113
 Bagdad, knowledge brought from, 123
 Baldwin, Stanley (later Earl), 848 *ff.*
 Balfour, Arthur, chief secretary for
 Ireland, 832, 833
 premier, 836
 Ball, John, 225, 235
 Balliol, John, 177-179
 Edward, 202-203
 Ballot Act, 823
 Baltimore, Lord, colonizes Mary-
 land, 474
 Bamborough, Penda's attack on, 23

oft, Archbishop, his suppression of Calvinism, 441
 of, massacre of the monks of, 15
 of England; *see* Montague
 of, *see* Battles
 of, rise of, 524
 of, Parliament, 547, 548
 of, Bishop of St. David's, 332
 of, 445
 of, greater and lesser, 162, 163
 of, power after the struggle with
 of, Henry the Third, 189-191
 of, influence on Newton, 579
 of, of, Day, St., in 1662, 588;
 of, also St. Bartholomew
 of, the Puritan, 494
 of, Abbey, 74, 85
 of, Aboukir, 767
 of, 42
 of, court, 252, 253
 of, andun, 58
 of, aye, 769
 of, enry, 418
 of, terlitz, 770
 of, esford, 8, 9
 of, ion (Mount), 11
 of, inockburn, 199
 of, bury Hill, 14
 of, net, 271
 of, isington, 39
 of,nheim, 669
 of, odino, 776
 of, vines, 117, 118
 of, ne, 653, 654
 of, dford, 31
 of, nanburgh, 50
 of, ker's Hill, 729
 of, ford, 38
 of, perdown, 759
 of, grove, 514
 of, rford, 10
 of, rmouth, 42
 of, ster, 16, 152
 of, ppewa, 780
 of, quereux, 93
 of, enhagen, 767
 of, unna, 772
 of, ssy, 211-213
 of, loden, 701
 of, rham, 13, 152
 of, tingen, 699
 of, nbar, 539
 of, ehill, 512, 513
 of, ngton, 41
 of, andun, 10
 of, sham, 149
 of, kirk, 179
 of, urus, 757
 of, dden, 366
 of, tenoy, 699
 of, ntes d'Onoro, 774
 of, lidon Hill, 209
 of, stings; *see* Senlac
 of, tfield, 20
 of, avensfield, 20
 of, ngestesdun, 42
 of, mildon Hill, 359
 of, erlochy, 521
 of, nappes, 755

Battles, Jena, 770
 June 1st, 759
 Killiecrankie, 647
 Kilsyth, 522
 La Hogue, 659
 Lansdowne Hill, 514
 Leipzig, 779
 Lewes, 147
 Lexington, 729
 Malplaquet, 675
 Marengo, 760
 Marignano, 305
 Marston Moor, 510
 Maserfeld, 22
 Minden, 710
 Mortemer, 70
 Mortimer's Cross, 269
 Mount Badon; *see* Badon (Mount)
 Naseby, 523
 Nechtansmere, 32
 Neville's Cross, 213, 359
 Newbury, 515
 Newtown Butler, 619
 Nile, the, 759
 Northallerton, 95
 Orthez, 779
 Otford, 39
 Otterburn, 359
 Parret, 44
 Philiphaugh, 522
 Pinkie Clough, 360
 Plassey, 709
 Poitiers, 215, 216
 Preston Pans, 700
 Quebec, 711, 712
 Quiberon, 710
 Ramillies, 672
 Rossbach, 707
 Salamanca, 770
 Saratoga, 731
 Secundun, 35
 Sedgemoor, 628
 Senlac, 73, 11
 Sheriffmuir, 682
 Shrewsbury, 250
 Solway Moss, 360
 Somerton, 35
 St. Albans, 267
 Stamford Bridge, 72
 Stirling, 179
 Stow, 523
 St. Vincent, 735
 Talavera, 773
 Tenchebray, 89
 Torres Vedras, 774
 Toulon, 757
 Toulouse, 779
 Towton, 269
 Trafalgar, 769, 770
 Val-ès-dunes, 69
 Varaville, 71
 Vimiera, 772
 Vinegar Hill, 759
 Vittoria, 779
 Wagram, 773
 Wakefield, 268
 Wareham, 44
 Waterloo, 783
 Winwæd, 23

Battles, Worcester, 541
 Baxter, Richard, his estimate of Cromwell's church appointments, 553
 his attitude towards Richard Cromwell, 560
 reputation as a controversialist, 589
 his account of the expulsion of the nonconformist clergy, 591
 his opposition to the Declaration of Indulgence, 633
 Bayeux, Norse language remains at, 66
 tapestry of, as an authority, 68
 Beaufort, Cardinal, his position at accession of Henry VI., 257
 leads the war party, 264
 Beauforts, the, 272 *n.*
 Beaumont contrasted with Ben Jonson, 413
 Bec, Abbey of, founded by Herlouin, 66
 Becket; *see* Beket
 Bede, the Venerable; *see* Beda
 Bedford, Duke of, in Henry the Sixth's time, effect of his death, 257
 his relations with the Duke of Gloucester, 259
 Bedford, Lord, in Charles the First's time, proposal of the king to him, 504
 Bedford, Duke of, in George the Third's time, 720
 Bedloe, his assistance to Oates, 615
 Beggars in Elizabeth's reign, 371
 Beket, Gilbert, father of the archbishop, 86
 Thomas, first English Archbishop of Canterbury since the Conquest, 88
 influenced by the Cistercians, 88
 his relations with Theobald, 96
 his education, 96
 invites Henry II. to England, *ib.*
 fights in France, 99
 his election to the See of Canterbury, 99
 his struggle with Henry, 99-101
 his death, 101
 and Constitutions of Clarendon, 104 *n.*
 Bellarmine, Cardinal, 445
 Benedict of Peterborough, 110
 Benedict, Bishop, his abbey at Jarrow, 27
 his journeys, *ib.*
 Benfleet, Danish camp at, 48
 Bentham, Jeremy, his creed, 778
 and Parliamentary reform, 802
 Bentinck, Lord George, and Free Trade, 812
 Beornwulf, struggles and death, 40
 Bereta, her marriage with Æthelberht, 17
 Berkley, Judge, his opinion on Hampden's case, 497
 Bernicia, kingdom of, 15
 Bertrand de Born, 108 *n.*

Bertrand de Born, leads an insurrection against Richard I., 105
 Berwick, Edward the First's attack on, 177
 cause of its peculiar position, 202
 pacification of, 499
 Treaty of, 203 *n.*
 Bessin, the, ravaged by the French, 69
 Berley, Alfred of, his history, 111
 Bigod, Earl, threatened by Henry the Third, 144
 Bigod, Earl Roger, opposes Edward the First, 193
 Bill of Rights; *see* Statutes
 Birinus, a missionary in Wessex, 22
 Biscop, Benedict, his career, 27
 Bishops, the Seven, trial and acquittal of, 633
 its effect, 639; *see* Sancroft, Jefferys, etc.
 Bismarck, and Prusso-Danish War, 817
 Black Death, the, its effects, 232, 233
 Blake, Admiral, 539, 542, 543, 556
 his body taken from the grave, 587
 Blanchard, a French patriot, 253
 Blanketeers, March of, 797
 Blood-bond, the, in early England, 3
 Blount, Sir Thomas, at Edward the Second's deposition, 197
 Blucher, General, 782
 Boccaccio, opinion held of, in England, 377
 Boethius, Consolations of, translated by Ælfred, 47
 Bohemia, James the First's policy towards, 457, 458
 Bohun, Humphrey de, opposes Edward the First, 193
 Bosil, a missionary, 21
 Boleyn, Anne, Henry's passion for her, 310, 312
 her coronation, 318
 her execution, 335
 her influence on the character of Elizabeth, 350
 Bolingbroke, Lord, takes office, 671
 dismissed from office, 674
 his attacks on the war with France, 675
 his treaty of commerce, 679
 his intrigues with the Pretender, *ib.*
 his policy, 680, 688
 and Jacobite restoration, 691 *n.*
 Bologna, university of, in the thirteenth century, 124, 127
 Boniface, the missionary, 39
 Boniface the Eighth (Pope), his claims, 180
 his Bull Clericis Laicos, 193
 Bonner, Bishop, his character and persecution, 345, 346
 his "Six Bibles," 431
 Booth, Charles, "Life and Labour in London," 833
 old age pensions, 837
 Boroughs, representation of, 165-167
 rise of, 181-183
 "rotten," 383 *n.*

, attacks on tea-ships at, 727
 Al, his character, 366, 367
 es; *see* Battles; effects of, 117
 nvents the air-pump, 578
 ; *see* Battles
 , the party so-called, 689
 ugh, Charles, 829
 aw, John, made Judge of
 gh Court, 534
 n Parliament of 1654, 547
 ody taken from the grave, 587
 eth's Rising, 797
 y, treaty of, 216
 e of, 216 *n.*
 m, treaty of, 177
 John, and women suffrage,
 8
 Anti-Corn Law League, 812
 Ten Hours Act, 813
 Home Rule, 831
 e, set up by Offa in Wessex, 41
 , Roman conquest of, 4
 t of that conquest on, 5
 ent of the northern nations
 , 6, 7
 conquest of it, 7-11
 North America Act, 818
 , their attempted extermina-
 on, 10
 later struggles, 13-15
 y, conquest of, by Fule of
 you, 92
 y, duke of, Arthur; *see*
 thur
 , Lord, a leader of the Presby-
 rians, 508
 am, Lord, helps to edit
Inburgh Review, 778
 e, Archbishop, 423
 ists, the, 442, 524
 Robert, his claims on Scot-
 and, 176
 the English, 178
 gles for independence of
 otland, 180
 e with Edward II., 196
 her struggles of, 197-200
 David, 202
 , Elizabeth's discussion with,
 3
 vick, Duke of, marches against
 ance, 754, 755
 and Home Rule, 831
 burning of his bones, 348
 ngham, Duke of, Edward
 hun, his execution, 307
 ge Villiers the First, James
 e First's favour for, 456
 es the First's warning to, 463
 les the First's defence of, 465
 mpeachment, *ib.*
 policy and its effect, 467
 rivalry with Strafford, 486
 leath, 470
 ge Villiers the Second sup-
 orts the old Presbyterian
 urty, 604
 to the Tower by Danby, 612
 ian atrocities, 827

Bull and bear baiting, 805
 Bungay, his reputation, 142
 Bunyan, John, 437, 438
 his imprisonment, 592
 the "Pilgrim's Progress" and
 other writings, 592-594
 opposition to Declaration of In-
 dulgences, 633
 Buonaparte, Napoleon, defeats the
 English at Toulon, 757
 his successes in Italy, 758
 invades Egypt, 759
 defeated in Syria, 759
 crosses the Alps, 760
 his aims, 768
 his tyranny in France, 768
 his alliance with Russia, 771
 his intrigues in Spain, 772, 773
 his conquest of Austria, 773
 his alliance with America, 775
 his defeat in Russia, 776
 his fall, 779
 his return, 781
 his final overthrow, 783; *see* also
 Pitt, Wellington, Battles
 Buonaparte, Jerome, 772
 Buonaparte, Louis, *ib.*
 Buonaparte, Joseph, *ib.*
 Burbage, opinion of Shakspeare, 407
 Burdett, Sir Francis, moves for
 reform of Parliament, 778
 Burgoyne, General, 730
 effect of his defeat, 731
 Burke, Edmund, his impeachment of
 Warren Hastings, 740
 Bill for Economical Reform, 744
 his attitude towards the French
 Revolution, 751, 752
 his early career, *ib.*
 his political principles, 749
 reflections on the French Revolu-
 tion, 752
 his opposition to Pitt and Fox, 752
 his "appeal from the new to the
 old Whigs," 752
 his advice to "diffuse terror," 754
 letters on a Regicide Peace, 758
 his death, 758
 Burleigh, Lord, Elizabeth's choice
 of, 353
 her confidence in him, 361
 zeal for Protestant succession, 366
 opinion of the extravagance of
 wine-buyers, 374
 Burley, the schoolman, his reputa-
 tion, 142
 Burnet, Bishop, his estimate of
 Cromwell's rule, 552
 of Shaftesbury's temper, 607
 of Charles the Second's temper,
 619
 Burton, the Puritan, 494
 Bute, Lord, his character, 717
 his fall, 720
 Butler, author of "Hudibras," 569
 Butt, Isaac, 821
 CABAL, the, 617
 Cabinet, rise of, 617

Cabinet, the first, 658
 Cabot, Sebastian, his discoveries, 286, 472
 his father, 472
 Cade, Jack, his rising, 265
 Cadwallon, king of Wales, his struggle against Northumbria, 20
 his death, 20
 Caedmon, the first English poet, 18
 story of his vision, 25
 importance of his poem, 26
 Caen sacked by the French, 70
 Caesar, Julius, reveals Britain to Rome, 4
 revival of study of his works in thirteenth century, 124
 Cairo, convention of, 767
 Calais taken by Edward III., 213
 Calamy helps the Presbyterians, 508
 Cambridge, University of, our ignorance of its early history, 123
 its reputation for heresy, 330
 treatment of, by James II., 631
 Cameromans, their resistance to the Scotch Act of Union, 673
 Campbell, Sir Colin, 789, 816
 Campbell-Bannerman, Sir Henry, 836, 837
 Campian, a Jesuit leader, 387, 445
 Campo Formio, treaty of, 758
 Canada, conquest of, 710-712
 establishment of its constitution, 752
 invasion of, by the United States, 780
 later revolts in, 787
 Lord Durham's Report, 808, 809
 Canning, George, his devotion to Pitt, 741
 his Ministry, 771
 his firmness after Corunna, 773
 his opinion about Walcheren Expedition, 773
 his eagerness for Catholic Emancipation, 778, 785
 his foreign policy, 785, 799
 his death, 785
 Canterbury, Augustine at, 17, 18
 the centre of Latin influence, 18
 plundered by the Danes, 42
 Scriptorium of, 109
 Canterbury Tales, 158, 207-209
 Capel, Lord, his execution, 537
 Capuchins, the preachers of Catholicism, 445
 Cardwell, Land Act, 821
 army reforms, 823
 Carlisle, conquered by Northumbrians, 31
 Carlyle, 818
 Caroline of Anspach, Queen of George the Second, 687
 her death, 688
 Carr, James the First's favour to, 456
 Carteret, his policy, 698
 Cartwright, Thomas, 439
 driven from his Professorship, 442
 growth of his doctrines, 508

Casaubon, his view of English feeling about literature, 433
 Castlemaine, Lady, her conversion, 605
 Castlereagh, Lord, his incompetence, 773
 his opposition to reform, 784
 his suicide, 785
 Catherine of Arragon, her sympathy with Spain, 307
 her appeal to the Pope, 311
 see also Henry the Eighth
 Catherine the Second of Russia, her partitions of Poland, 748
 Catholic Association, 800
 University (Ireland), 838
 Catholics, Roman, feelings of towards Elizabeth, 357, 361
 their revolts against her, 368-370
 their relations with Mary Stuart, 363
 decline of their faith, 384
 persecution of them, 386
 their attitude during the reigns of Elizabeth and James I., 444-446
 Charles the First's policy towards them, 463
 excluded from the Parliament (of 1657), 559
 their hopes in Charles the Second's reign, 613
 their position in Ireland, 762
 struggle for their emancipation, 766, 786
 Cato Street Conspiracy, 784
 Cavendish, family of, rise of, from spoil of monasteries, 329
 Cavendish, Lord, helps to lead Country party, 605
 his support of William III., 641
 Cavendish, Lord Frederick, murdered, 830
 Caxton, William, his career, 279-282
 Ceadda; see Chad, S.
 Cecil, William, see Burleigh, Lord
 Cecil, Robert, Elizabeth's speech to, 430
 effect of his death, 456
 Cecil, the Evangelical, 696
 Cedd, his visit to Chad, 24
 Centwine, King of Wessex, 34
 Cenwulf, succeeds Offa in Mercia, 40
 Ceolfrid, a scholar of Biscop's, 36
 Ceolwulf, King of Northumbria, 35
 Ceorl; see Churl (12, 15 n.)
 Cerdic, chosen King of West Saxons, Ceylon retained by England at Peace of Amiens, 767
 Chad, S., mission to the Mercians, 23
 his death, 23
 Chadwick, Edwin, and Poor Law Reform, 806
 and public health, 813, 821
 Chalcondylas lectures at Oxford, 287
 Chamberlain, Joseph, and Home Rule, 831
 "unauthorised programme," 833
 and Salisbury's third ministry, 834

- rlain, Joseph, and colonial
 ference, 836
 rlain, Neville, 852, 859 ff.
 y, court of, in reign of
 ward the First, 180
 ned by Cromwell, 553
 the Great, his struggle with
 a, 40, 41 n.
 the Fifth, the Emperor,
 her's answer to him, 303
 licy towards Henry VIII., 307
 the Sixth of France, 251
 X. of France, his fall, 786
 the First of England
 roposal about his marriage,
 -463
 ct towards the Catholics, 463
 ow of Parliaments, 465
 sence of Buckingham, 465;
 Buckingham, Eliot, Pym,
 nppen
 oppression of Parliaments;
 Parliaments
 nancial policy, 482
 stinacy, 485
 pts to arrest five members,
 effect of his attempt, 509
 standard at Nottingham,

 rigues after Naseby, 527
 al and death, 535
 of his death, 535
 he Second, his accession, 562
 tance of his time, 567
 dy of physical science, 578
 dictive demands, 585
 licy about the Act of Uni-
 nity, 588
 licy after restoration, 594 n.
 racter, 595-597
 ling about Roman Catholi-
 cism, 598
 ew of England contrasted
 that of James II., 599
 ations with Lewis XIV., 599
 Edward, the Young Pre-
 ler, his insurrection against
 rge the Second, 700-702
 of Henry the First, 84
 don, 86
 eat, 119-121
 i, 809
 Galliard, its importance to
 hard the First, 106
 lish history, 108
 i, Earl of, effect of Pitt's
 ng the title, 723
 less, 723
 ip parliamentary reform, 725
 es the attack on the Boston
 ships, 727
 neasures for conciliating
 erica, 728, 731
 ath, 731
 of his dying appeal, 731, 732
 f parliamentary reform, 743
 o Pitt, William, the Elder
 his English, 158
 e of English, 205
 ter and work, 206-209

 Chaucer, laughs at pardoners, 220,
 and abbots, 222
 his exceptional position, 277
 Caxton's reverence for, 280
 Chauvelin, French ambassador for
 Republic, 754
 Chester, its situation, 16
 Danes driven from, 48
 entered by William the Conqueror,
 76; *see also* Battles
 Chester, Earl of, rebels against
 Henry the Third, 133
 Chesterfield, Lord, 687
 his letters, 693
 his opinion of state of England at
 time of Seven Years' War, 702
 Chettle, his opinion of Shakspeare, 407
 Chichester, Bishop of, his relations
 with De Montfort, 148
 Chichester, Sir Arthur, his rule in
 Ireland, 428
 Child labour; *see* Factory legislation
 Chillingsworth, his denunciations of
 persecution, 579
 China, treaty with, 788
 Chinese labour, 836
 Chippenham, Danes appear at, 44
 Chivalry of Froissart, 170
 of Edward the First, 170, 171
 Christianity, original dislike of, by
 the Northern nations who came
 to England, 11
 introduction into England, 17-26
 Chronicle, the English, as an
 authority, 7, 34, 42
 in Ælfred's reign, 48, 49, 57, 75
 Church of England founded by
 Theodore of Tarsus, 28
 reformed by William and Lan-
 franc, 79
 representation in Parliament, 168
 degradation of, in fourteenth and
 fifteenth centuries, 209
 its position from time of Edward
 IV. to that of Elizabeth, 274, 275
 attitude of its leaders towards the
 New Learning, 292
 Erasmus's attitude towards, 296
 More's, 303, 304
 Thomas Cromwell's, 316
 Elizabeth's, 355
 Oliver Cromwell's, 553
 Church of Ireland; *see* Ireland,
 Church of
 Churchill, John, Sunderland's speech
 to, 633; *see* Marlborough, Duke
 of
 Churchill, Winston (later Sir), 838,
 895, 861, 865 ff.
 Churl, his position, 3, 4
 Cistercians, revive religious zeal in
 twelfth century, 88
 Civil Service, admission to by
 examination, 823
 Civil War, American, 817
 Clair-sur-Epte, peace of, 65
 Clare, Lord, rewarded by William the
 First with grants of land, 78
 Clarendon, Constitutions of, 99
 and Becket, 104 n.

Clarendon, Assize of, 103
 Clarendon, Lord, view of the state of the country in early part of Charles the First's reign, 486
 made Chancellor, 584
 his royalism, 584
 suggests amendments in Act of Uniformity, 588
 his fall, 601
 his illegal proclamations, 625; *see also* Hyde
 Clarendon, second Lord, 632
 succeeded in government of Ireland by Tyrconnell, 640
 intrigues with James II., 656
 Clarkson, Thomas, sympathy of the Methodists with him, 697
 Claudius, Emperor; *see* Britain, Roman conquest of
 Clement the Fourth, his friendship for Roger Bacon, 131, 132
 the Seventh, Catherine's appeal to; *see* Catherine of Arragon
 Clifford, Lord, in Henry the Sixth's time, his career, 268
 in Charles the Second's time, his share in treaty of Dover, 603
 his advice about suspending payments, 604
 Clive, Robert, his rise, 708
 his early battles, 709
 helps Pitt to a seat in Parliament, 718
 his reforms in India, 732
 attitude towards him taken by the House of Commons, 733
 Closter-Seven, convention of, 702
 Pitt's rejection of it, 707
 Cnut, comes to the throne, 58
 change in his character, 58
 his letter from Rome, 59
 his laws, 60
 his death, 61
 his earldoms, 61 *n.*
 Cobbett, "Political Register," 794, 796
 parliamentary reform, 802
 and State Education, 805
 and Poor Law Reform, 806
 Cobden, Richard, and Anti-Corn Law League, 812
 Coifi, argument for Christianity, 19
 Coke, Mr., of Norfolk, his large farms, 743
 Coke, Sir Edward, his reverence for law, 455
 his death, 500
 Coleman, his letters about the Popish Plot, 613
 Colepepper, his denunciation of monopolists, 485
 leaves Parliament after the Hull affair, 511
 Colet, Dean, exceptional position, 286
 his teachings, 287, 288
 his school, 294
 his sermons, 292, 295, 296
 Colman, his contest with Wilfrith, 28
 Cologne, University of, its relations with Oxford, 141

Colonial Policy, Lord Durham's Report, 808-809
 Columba founds the monastery of Iona, 21
 his authority appealed to, 27
 Columban, an Irish missionary, 21
 effect of his work in England, 22
 Columbus discovers New World, 286
 Combination Acts (1824, 1825), 799, 800
 Communes, Philip de, his exceptional position, 287
 Commission, Court of High, 586
 Commons, House of, how it was formed, 217
 its early timidity, 218
 force of its petitions, 218
 struggles with John of Gaunt, 219
 its degeneracy under the Lancastrians, 256
 restriction of the right of election to it, 257
 its attitude in 1520, 315
 its position in Elizabeth's reign, 382-383
 in William the Third's reign, 657
 its relations with Walpole, 687
 condition in time of elder Pitt, 718
 question of its reform, 725, 743, 778, 786, 790; *see also* Pitt, Wilkes, Chatham, Burdett
 Commonwealth, the English, 535-544
 Commune, rise of, 188
 Companies, Livery, 188
 Compton, Bishop, his suspension from his office, 631
 support of William of Orange, 641
 Comyn, John, Edward's vow to avenge his murder, 171
 Connecticut; *see* Warwick, Earl of
 Conventicle Act, passing of, 590
 Convention, the, in 1660
 its attitude towards Charles the Second, 584-587
 Convocation, silencing of, by Henry the Eighth, 319
 draws up Articles of Religion, 320
 Cooper, Ashley, returned to Barebone's Parliament, 546
 opposes Richard Cromwell, 560
 advises restoration of expelled members, 562
 made Lord Ashley and Chancellor of Exchequer, 584; *see* Ashley, Lord, Shaftesbury, Lord
 Co-operation, Rochdale Pioneers, 811
 Co-operative Wholesale Society, 817
 Coote, Sir Eyre, 732, 734
 Cope, Sir John, in 1745, 700
 Copernicus, effect of his discoveries, 286
 Cordova, the learning brought from, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, 123
 Corn, exportation of, by Britain, 5
 Laws, repeal of, 788
 Cornwall, Richard, on reign of Edward the Third, 204

all, effect on, of victory of
 orham, 18
 ceptional position, 514
 all, Richard, Earl of, rises
 against Henry the Third, 144
 captured at battle of Lewes, 147
 allis, Lord, his defeat in
 nerica, 735
 ule in Ireland, 763
 in, conquest of, 65
 , oppression of, 500
 l, the Great, 162-165
 Royal Ordinances of, 218
 ased power of, under Edward
 e Fourth, 273
 y Party, formation of, 605
 nay, bishop and archbishop,
 s relations with the Lollards,
 7, 243, 244
 quis of Exeter, his insurrection
 d execution, 327
 unt, the Scotch, signing of, in
 40, 497
 nn League and, 515
 icly burnt after Restoration,
 7
 shed in Scotland, 598
 ry, Sir William, helps to lead
 e Country Party, 605
 ale, Miles, revises the trans-
 jon of the Bible, 321
 t of his translation; *see* Eng-
 ad, Literature of
 r, William, Lord Keeper, 671
 nen, rise of, 181
 gilds, 185, 186
 ld, Earl of Middlesex, his
 smissal, 463
 er, Thomas, his proposal
 out the universities, 316
 ntment to Canterbury, 318
 ns Anne Boleyn, 318
 is for Cromwell, 322
 d from arrest by Henry, 334
 nger after Six Articles Act, 337
 mes a decided Protestant, 337
 ted, 341
 xecution, 347
 , invasion of, 789
 n War, 814-815
 ton, his invention of the
 Mule," 742
 ell, Thomas, his career, 313,
 6; *see* also Cranmer
 oreign policy, 340 n.
 ell, Oliver, his words at Dun-
 r, 432
 r of his first attempt to leave
 ighland, 481
 econd threat of leaving it, 507
 Marston Moor, 516
 arly career, 518
 nizes the Ironsides, 519, 521
 attitude towards the Pres-
 terians, 526
 art in the discussions between
 eton and the King, 531
 victories against Royalists,
 48-9, 533

Cromwell, Oliver, suppresses the
 mutiny of the troops, 537
 his wars in Ireland and Scotland,
 537-540
 his dissolution of the Rump, 543
 his Protectorate, 544-560
 effect of his death, 560
 his body taken from the grave,
 587
 Cromwell, Henry, his settlement of
 Ireland, 552
 Cromwell, Richard, peaceable ac-
 cession of, 560
 his reign, 560
 Crowland, abbey of, its rise, 31
 Cumberland, Earl of, defends Ship-
 ton Castle, 326
 Customs, English, use of, by William
 the First, 79
 Cuthbert, story of his mission, 24-26
 his episcopal rule and death, 32-34
 Cuthwulf, King of West Saxons, 14

 DACRE, Lord, insurgent in reign of
 Henry the Eighth, 326
 also in reign of Elizabeth, 369
 Dalaber, Anthony, a follower of
 Tyndale, 331
 Dalhousie, Lord, effect of his annexa-
 tion of Oude, 789
 Danby, Lord, made Treasurer, 610
 his policy, 611-613
 cause of his fall, 614, 615
 his impeachment, 617
 his support of William of Orange,
 639-642
 compared with Walpole, 687
 Danegeld, arranged by Court of
 Exchequer, 90
 Danelagh, conquest of, by Eadward
 the Elder, 49
 Danes, their first invasion of Eng-
 land, 41-43
 repulsed by Ælfred, 44
 fresh invasion in reign of Æthelred,
 55
 massacre of, 56
 invasion of Swegen, 56
 slay Archbishop Ælfheah, 56
 their conquest of England, 57
 their rule, 58-60
 fall of their power, 60
 invade England under Swegen, 76
 induced to leave England by
 William I., 76
 invasion of, resisted by William I.,
 82
 Daniel, the poet, 377
 Darcy, Lord, insurgent in reign of
 Henry the Eighth, 326
 Darnley: *see* Mary Stuart
 Dartmouth, Lord, intrigues with
 James II., 656
 David, of Wales, rebellion and death
 of, 157
 Deane, General, his successes, 552
 Death duties, 834
 Declaration of Indulgence by Charles
 the Second, 604

- Declaration of Indulgence by James
the Second, 632
of Rights, 645
of Independence, 730
of Paris, 815
- Deira, kingdom of, 14, 15, 48 n.
becomes Yorkshire, 51
- Dekker, 410
- De la Mare, Peter, 220
- Deneuulf, Bishop of Winchester, 45
- Derby, Earl of, in Victoria's reign,
his first ministry, 789
his second ministry, 790
his Reform Bill, 790
- Derby, Henry, Earl of, his attitude in
Richard's reign, 247; *see* Henry
the Fourth
- Dermot, King of Leinster, 416, 418
- Desborough, General, resigns his
command to Cromwell, 558
- Descartes, a contemporary of Bacon,
576
- Desmond, Earl of, treatment of, by
Henry the Seventh, 418
by Elizabeth, 427
- D'Espece, influenced by the Cister-
cians in the twelfth century, 88
- Despensers, the, career of, 196
- Devon Commission, 821
- Devonshire, Duke of, 834
- Devonshire, effect on, of victory of
Deorham, 16
men of, rise against Normans, 76
- De Witt, his utterance about English
sailors, 594
his policy towards France, 637
his fall, 637
- Digby, Lord, his denunciation of
Stratford, 503
- Digges, Sir Dudley, his taunt to
Buckingham, 466
his imprisonment, 466
- Dilke, Sir Charles, 831
- Disestablishment, Welsh, 830
- Disraeli, Benjamin, his Reform Bill,
790
his different ministries, 791
and E. Chadwick, 806
and condition of Irish poor, 812
and Free Trade, 812
- Dock strike, London, 833
- Domesday Book as an authority, 75
how it was compiled, 79
- Dominic, zeal of, 139
- Dominicans, lectures at Oxford, 141
- Dorchester, established as the poli-
tical see of South Britain, 22
- Dorsetshire, the men of, rise against
the Normans, 76
- Douglas, his relations with Bruce,
200-201
- Dover secured by William the Con-
queror, 74
its resistance to Lewis of France,
122
treaty of, 602
- Drake, Sir Francis, early career, 392
his check to the Armada, 395
his final defeat of it, 396
- Drake, Sir Francis, his voyage
round the world, 398
- Drogheda, massacre of, 538
- Dryden, his view of the importance
of the Triple Alliance, 602
his account of Shaftesbury, 607
- Dudo of Quentin, as an authority, 65
- Dumouriez, General, his first suc-
cesses, 755
- Dundee, Marquis of, his struggle
against William the Third, 647
- Duns Scotus, his rank as a school-
man, 141
- Dunstan, his early life, 50
Abbot of Glastonbury, 51
Minister of Eadmund, 51
policy of, 51
exiled, 52
Bishop of London and Winchester,
52
Archbishop of Canterbury, 52
Minister of Eadgar, revives
monasteries, 53
crowns Eadward the Martyr, 55
death of, 55
importance of his life, 110
- Dupleix, founds French empire in
India, 702
his career, 708, 709
- Durham, Bishop of, at battle of
Falkirk, 179
- Durrow, University at, 21
- Dykveldt, his work for William of
Orange in England, 641
- EADBERT, King of Northumbria,
38
Pippin's friendship for him, 39
- Eadgar, King, 52
his laws, 53
- Eadgar the Ætheling, placed on
the English throne, 74
submits to the Conqueror, 74
joins the Danes, 76
takes refuge in Scotland, 77
establishes a king there, 84
- Eadmer, his life of Anselm, 110
- Eadmund, King of East Anglia,
murder of, 43
- Eadmund Ironside, his struggles and
death, 58
- Eadric of Mercia, murder of, by
Cnut, 59
- Eadward the Confessor, made king, 62
his favour to the Normans, 63
struggle with Godwine, 63
his death, 64
story of his promise to Duke
William, 71
- Eadward the Elder, 49
his conquests, 49
chosen king by the Scots, 174
- Eadward the Martyr, crowned by
Dunstan, 55
murdered, 55
- Eadwig the Fair, his marriage, 52
banishes Dunstan, 52
- Eadmund Ironside's brother,
murdered by Cnut, 59

- vine, an exile from Northumbria, 16
 mes to Northumbrian throne, 18
 reign and death, 18, 19, 20
 Mercia, supports Eadgar the Ætheling, 75
 mits to William, 75
 helm, Bishop, his songs, 46
 ormen, 3
 red, Archbishop of York, crowns William the Conqueror, 74
 red of Northumbria, his appeal to Charles the Great, 39
 stan, Bishop of Sherburne, 42
 wulf, King of Northumbria, received when an exile by Charles the Great, 39
 , creation of, 61 n.
 Anglia, conquered by Jutes, 16
 comes Christian, 18
 quered by Mercia, 39
 els against Mercia, 40
 ding of the Danes there, 42
 rldom of, created by Cnut, 59;
 ee also Eadmund, Rædwald
 India Company, territories taken over by Crown, 816
 Saxons; *see* Essex, Saxons
 ir settlement, 13
 quered by Northumbria, 18
 thendom of their kings, 20
 fleet, first landing-place of English in Britain, 7
 Augustine, 17
 siastical Commission, 441
 rht, Archbishop of York, Beda's letter to, 38
 rht, King of Wessex, 40
 conquests, 40, 41
 omes king of the English, 41
 work undone by the Danes, 3
 th, his relations with his wife, 1
 rule of Northumbria, 31
 defeat, and death, 32
 ct of his death, 33
 mpt to conquer Scotland, 173
 ne, Bishop of Worcester, his reaching, 30
 Anthony (later Sir), 865
 , son of Margaret, made King of Scotland, 84
 urch, its foundation, 19
 omes capital of the Scotch
 ngs, 51
 urch Review started, 778
 nd; *see* Eadmund
 ndsbury, St., 43
 ws' Houses" at, 80
 vth of, 87, 88
 tion, public elementary, 809
 lic grant for, 813
 of 1870, 822
 of 1902, 836
 elementary, 833
 nent by results, 833
 le control, 836
 nical, 832
 nical (Ireland), 835
- Edward: for the pre-Norman kings, *see* Eadward
 Edward the First of England, his youth, 156
 his conquest of Wales, 156, 157
 relations to modern England, 158
 relations to Parliaments, 158
 his judicial reforms, 159, 160
 his legislation, 160, 161, 165
 his Parliaments, 167-169
 his personal character, 169-172
 his relations with Scotland, 172
 his conception of kingship, 188
 his treatment of the Jews and the clergy, 191, 192, 193
 his death, 194
 Edward the Second, his relations with the Barons, 194
 his truce with Bruce, 196
 his vices and fall, 196
 Edward the Third, his election, 197
 his arrest of Mortimer, 201
 and Scotland, 203 n.
 progress during his reign, 205-207
 effect of his accession, 210
 his relations with Flanders and France, 209-216
 with Parliament, 217-220
 assumes title King of France, 216 n.
 Edward the Black Prince, his share in the struggles against John of Gaunt, 220
 Edward the Fourth, his election, 269
 his marriage, deposition, and restoration, 270-272
 his position as a king, 273-277
 his character, 276
 Edward the Fifth, 282
 Edward the Sixth, 337-340
 Edward VII., accession of, 835
 death of, 838
 Edward VIII., *see* Windsor, Duke of
 Egypt, 830-831; *see* Buonaparte
 evacuation of, its effects, 767
 Eleanor, wife of De Montfort, 143
 wife of Edward the First, 157
 Elementary Education, compulsory (1876), 825
 Elfege, importance of his life, 110
 Eliot, Sir John, his first election, 454
 his position in the early struggle against Charles the First, 464
 attacks Buckingham, 465, 466
 his arrest, 466
 moves the Short Remonstrance, 469
 his opinion of Buckingham, 469
 his work the source of the Grand Remonstrance, 469
 Elizabeth I., Queen, state of England at her accession, 349
 appearance and character, 349-351
 her policy, 351-353
 effect of her policy; *see* England
 foreign policy, 370 n.
 her ecclesiastical policy, 385
 her last days, 429
 her "tuning the pulpits," 432
 immorality of her court, 473
 Elizabeth II., 865

- Ely, Abbey of, founded, 31
 burnt by Danes, 43
 Employers' Liability Act (1881), 828
 Encumbered Estates Act (1849), 821
 England, Old, its origin, 1, 2
 character of its inhabitants and laws, 2-5
 England, Literature of, how affected by Ælfred, 47
 poverty of, under Harold, 64
 how it explains the position of the country in time of John, 109
 between Chaucer and Caxton, 277-279
 its revival under Elizabeth, 376
 effect of Tyndale and Coverdale on, 431
 England, Church of; *see* Church of England
 England, New, its position after war between United States and England, 775
 English Conquest, 15 *n.*
 English language, progress of, in time of Edward the Third, 205
 Earl, in Early England, 3
 Episcopacy; *see* Pym, Hampden
 Erasmus, his visit to England, 289
 his "Praise of Folly," 291
 Essex, first colonization of, by English, 13 [353]
 Essex, Earl of, Elizabeth's favour to, his failure in Ireland, 428
 Essex, Earl of, in Long Parliament, appointed leader of Parliamentary forces, 512
 his policy, 513
 raises siege of Gloucester, 515
 Essex, Earl of, in Charles the Second's time, takes office, 616
 his policy, 619, 621
 his death, 624
 Estates, distribution of, by William I., 81 *n.*
 Ethelweard, his exceptional position in our literature, 109
 Eugene of Savoy, his success at Cremona, 669
 his union with Marlborough, 670
 Euphuism, discussed by Elizabeth, 353
 protest of Marlowe against it, 406
 gives way before Puritanism, 412; *see also* Lyly
 Eustace of Boulogne, his strife with burghers of Dover, 63
 his aid sought by men of Kent against Normans, 75
 Eustace "the Monk," 122
 Evesham, origin of, 30
 battle of; *see* Battles
 Examiner, the, written by Bollingbroke, 675
 Exchequer, Court of, its work under Henry the First, 90
 Excise Bill, 686
 Exclusion Bill, 610
 Exeter, siege of, by the Danes, 44
 Exeter, takes active part against the Normans, 75
 besieged by the English, 75
 relieved by Fitz-Osbern, 76
 welcomes the Barons, 118
 FACTORY ACT, Lord Althorp's, 805
 legislation, Mr. Matthews' Act, 833
 Fagus, burning of his bones, 348
 Fairfax, General, his first appointment by Parliament, 513
 effect on him of the king's treason, 533
 raises the cry of a free Parliament, 561
 Falkirk, battle of; *see* Battles
 Falkland, Lord, his character, 506
 his views on Church Reform, 508
 leaves Parliament after the refusal of Hotham, 511
 his death, 515
 his theology, 570
 Farmer-class, rise of, 231
 Pastoff, Sir John, his patronage of Caxton, 282
 Faukes de Breauté, his rebellion, 133
 Fawcett, Henry, and women suffrage, 818
 Fawkes, Guy; *see* Gunpowder Plot
 Federalism, Canada, 818-819
 South Africa, 826
 Ferras, Bishop of St. David's, execution of, 346
 Feudalism, introduced by William the First, 77
 Edward I.'s relations to, 192
 effect of, on England, 78
 relation of universities to, 127
 ruined by Wars of Roses, 273
 Fielden, and "Ten Hours" agitation, 805
 Ten Hours Act, 813
 Finch, Chief-Justice, his opinion on Hampden's case, 497
 Fisher, Bishop, his favour to Erasmus, 295
 his answer to Luther, 304
 Fitz-Neal, book on the Exchequer, 110
 Fitz-Osbern, Roger, rebels against William, 81
 Fitz-Osbern, William, is left in charge of England by William the First, 75
 relieves Exeter, 76
 receives grant of manors, 78
 Fitz-Osbert; *see* William Longbeard
 Fitz-Ralf, Archbishop, his attack on Friars, 223
 Fitz-Thomas, chosen mayor, 188
 Fitzurse; *see* Beket, death of
 Fitz-Walter, Captain of the City of London, 87
 Marshal of the Army of God and the Holy Church, 118
 taken prisoner, 122
 Fitz-Warren, Fulk, drives Martin from England, 137
 Fitz-William family, rise of, from spoil of monasteries, 329

re Mile Act, 590, 591
 instead, the astronomer, 578
 nder, relations of Edward the
 Third to, 210
 Jaxton educated in, 279
 importance of its trade to Eng-
 land, 367
 etwood, resigns his command to
 Cromwell, 558
 emonstrates against the dissolu-
 tion of 1657, 559
 us conduct during the second
 Protectorate, 561
 tcher, contrasted with Ben Jon-
 son, 413
 od, Henry, his support of Irish
 independence, 762
 rence, of Worcester, as an autho-
 rity, 48, 56, 75
 rence, poets of, 128, 138
 or relations to letters in the six-
 teenth century, 287
 k, greater and lesser, in towns, 186
 taineblean, treaty of, 772
 d contrasted with Ben Jonson,
 413
 est laws, the, enacted by Cnut, 60
 ster, W. E., Education Act of
 1870, 822
 tesque, Sir John, his doctrine
 about English monarchy, 273;
 see also 287
 c, Bishop, his favour to Erasmus,
 297
 us favour to Wolsey, 305
 x, George, his prophecy of Crom-
 well's death, 559
 x, Charles James, his opinion of
 Pitt, 737
 us coalition with Lord North, 738
 us India Bill, 738
 us policy towards France, 741
 us enthusiasm at fall of Bastille,
 750
 ntrigues about the Regency, 750
 us opinion of Burke, 752
 us Libel Act, 752
 us support of France, 756
 George the Third's dislike of, 769
 us ministry, 770
 us death, 770
 c, W. J., and Anti-Corn Law
 League, 812
 re, John, his "Book of Martyrs,"
 385
 nce, early history of; see Lewis
 the Ninth, Edward the Third,
 Henry the Fifth, Joan of Arc,
 Lewis the Fourteenth, Lewis
 the Fifteenth, Voltaire, Rous-
 seau
 tates-Generalin, 747
 all of the Bastille in, 750
 ttitude of English statesmen
 towards; see Pitt, Fox, Burke
 colares war against Austria, 754
 colares war on England, 755
 haracter of its government during
 Revolution, 754

France, war with England; see Pitt;
 see also Buonaparte, Wellington
 Franchise Bill, 831
 Francis, of Assisi, his life, 139
 Francis the First of France, Henry
 the Eighth's friendship for, 305
 his interference with the Univer-
 sity of Paris, 316
 Franklin, Benjamin, Whitfield's
 effect on, 694
 Franks, relations with England, 39
 Frederick, Prince of Wales, son of
 George the Second, 688
 Frederic the Second, Emperor, how
 regarded in Europe, 128
 Frederick the Second of Prussia,
 seizes Silesia, 690
 his second war, 699
 his Seven Years' War, 702
 his opinion of Pitt, 703
 Pitt's assistance to him, 715
 Pitt's opinion of him, 707
 his despair at Pitt's fall, 717
 his administrative reform, 748
 Freeman, sinks into the villain, 53
 French influences on Edward the
 First, 170
 Friars, effect on English universities,
 128, 141
 work of, in towns, 141
 their struggle against learning, 141
 position in the Barons' war, 112
 attacked by Fitz-Ralf and Wychit,
 223
 Frisian, the story told of, by Bede, 12
 Frith Gilds, 183
 Frobisher, Elizabeth's favour to, 353
 his discoveries, 473
 Froissart, his view of chivalry; see
 Chivalry
 his picture of Edward at Poitiers,
 215
 Fulc, the Red, second Count of
 Anjou, 92
 the Good, third Count, 92
 the Black, his cruelty, 92
 of Jerusalem, 92
 GAGE, General, made governor of
 Massachusetts, 728
 Galtskell, Hugh, 000
 Galileo, a contemporary of Bacon,
 578
 Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, 335
 Garnet the Jesuit, 447
 Gauden, Dr., writes the "Eikon
 Basilike," 536
 Gaunt, Elizabeth, executed, 628
 Gaunt, John of, invades France, 219
 leads the Barons, 220
 despises the Commons, 220
 relations of, with Wychit, 224
 his claim on the Spanish crown, 245
 Gaveston, Piers, his character and
 career, 194
 Gay, his opinion of politicians, 716
 Geoffrey Martel, Count of Anjou, 70
 his death, 70
 compared with his father, 93

- Geoffrey, Grey-gown, his loss of power, 92 [92
of Anjou, how treated by his father, of Monmouth, his history, 110, 155
George I., his position contrasted with that of William and Mary and of Anne, 650
results of his accession, 679
George II., hatred of Walpole, 687
guided by his wife, 687
supports Carteret, 698
George III., effects of his rule, 715
his character and policy, 715, 716
his treatment of the House of Commons, 718
his despotic rule, 723
his opposition to Catholic Emancipation, 766
his death, 785
George the Fourth, accession of, 785
his attack on his wife, 785
death of, 801
George V., 838, 858
George VI., 857, 865
Gerald de Barri, his position in literature, 112
his work, 112, 113
Geraldines, the, in Ireland, 420
Gifford, Bonaventure, a Roman Catholic, President of Magdalene College, 632
Gildas, his account of the state of Britain, 11
Gilda, 183-186
Ginkell, General, 654
Girondins, their aim, 754 [791, 819
Gladstone, Mr., his first ministry, Disestablishment of Church in Ireland, 819
Irish Land Act (1870), 821
and Bulgarian atrocities, 827
second ministry, 829
third ministry, 831
and Egypt, 831
first Home Rule Bill, 831
fourth ministry, 834
second Home Rule Bill, 834
and House of Lords, 834
Glanvill, Ranulf de, takes the King of Scotland prisoner, 102
his treatise on law, 110
Glastonbury monastery, founded, 34
Dunstan born at, 50
Dunstan, Abbot of, 51
Arthur's tomb at, 111
Glencoe, massacre of, 648
Glendower, Owen, his rising, 250
Gloucester, Earl of, Gilbert de Clare, his relations with the Barons' party, 146, 148, 149
Gloucester, Duke of, uncle of Richard the Second, 245
Gloucester, Richard, Duke of; *see* Richard the Third
Gloucester, Duke Humphrey, his regency, 259
his relations with Jacqueline of Brabant, 260
his death, 265
Gloucester, Duke Humphrey, his seizure of the books at the Louvre, 282
Goderich, Lord, forms a ministry on Canning's principles, 785
Godolphin, his rise, 667, 668
his fall, 676
Godwine, his rise, 61
Earl of Wessex, 61
and murder of Atheling Ælfred, 61 *n.*
his ability and policy, 62
his wise rule, 62
his struggle with Eadward, 63
his exile, 63
his return and death, 63
Gondomar, 459
Goodman, Bishop, dies a papist, 479
"Good Parliament," the, 220 *n.*
Gordon, General, 830-831
Gower, his position as a poet, 277
Gram-pound disfranchised, 799
Grattan, Henry, his opposition to Pitt's financial policy, 745
support of Irish independence, 762
Gravelines, battle at, 397 *n.*
Greene, 405, 407, 408
Greenville, a leader of Cornish Royalists, 514
Greenway the Jesuit, 447
Greenwood, F., 825
Gregory the Great, his interview with the English slaves, 17
sends Augustine to England, 17
pastorals translated by Ælfred, 47
Gregory the Seventh, his struggle with William the First, 80
Grenville, why he lost America, 714
his dislike of Pitt, 720
comes into office, 720
his prosecution of Wilkes, 720
Grenville, Lord, his opinion of state of England, 757
refuses to take office without Fox, 767
comes into office, 769
dislikes slave trade, 771
driven from office, 771
Grey, Lady Jane, her marriage, 341
her reign, 341
her death, 343
Grey, Lord, his Reform Bill, 786
his other reforms, 787
Grey's, Earl, ministry and parliamentary reform, 803
Grimbald, Ælfred's employment of, 47
Grindecobbe, 238
Grocyne, fellow of New College, 287-289
Grosseteste, his advice to Bacon, 131
dies at feud with Rome, 139
his Constitutions, 139
his correspondence with De Montfort, 144
Grote, and Anti-Corn Law Association, 812
Grotius, his account of English theology, 433

ow, helps to found vegetable
physiology, 578
powder Plot, 446
Jhalac, Abbot of Crowland, 31
Jhrum, the Dane, becomes King of
East Anglia, 43
Elfred makes peace with, 44
r, of Amiens, his poem as an
authority, 68
alchmal, his song, 154
yn, Nell, Charles the Second's
request to James about, 627
th, son of Godwine, killed at
battle of Senlac, 73

BEAS CORPUS ACT, suspension of,
797 : see Statutes
e, Sir Matthew, appointed to
reform the law, 542, 547
introduces a bill for Church Com-
prehension, 587
es, a Latitudinarian, 447, 579
es, Sir Edward, 630
ifax, Lord, on Monmouth's suc-
cession, 618
n Exclusion Bill, 621
n Limitation Bill, 622
vice to Charles after passing
H. C. Act, 626
is dismissal, 629
resents crown to William III., 615
l, Bishop, his satires, 493
Jain, his opinion of Shakspeare, 411
f the law of conspiracy, 504
f position of Charles II., 624
ley, investigates ideas, etc., 578
nilton, Marquis of, as Royal
Commissioner in Scotland, 498
nilton, Duke of, rallies Royalists
against Argyll, 532, 533
ecution of, 537
npden, his attitude towards
Episcopacy, 438
is refusal of the forced loan, 467
is refusal to pay ship-money, 495
is trial, 496
is tact in hindering a fight in the
Commons, 507
is death, 514
court, Sir William, 834
die, Kerr, 837
ding, character of his Chronicles,
278
dy, trial of, 758
greaves, his invention of spin-
ning-jenny 742
ley, Robert, comes into office, 671
dismissed from office, 674
is patronage of Mrs. Masham, 676
is return to office, 676
itrigues with the Pretender, 679
eir effects, 680
old, King, Cnut's son, 60
old, son of Godwine, Earl of
East Anglia, 62
is statesmanship, 64
is campaign in Wales, 64
is accession, 64
is oath to Duke William, 72

Harold, son of Godwine, his pre-
parations for the struggle with
William, 72
defeats Harold Hardrada at Stam-
ford Bridge, 72
his death in battle of Senlac, 74
effect of his victories in Wales, 153
Harold Hardrada, King of Norway,
invades England, 72
is defeated at Stamford Bridge, 72
Harrison, General, his share in disso-
lution of the Rump, 544
his execution, 585
Harthacnut, King, 61
his crimes and lawlessness, 61
Hartington, Lord, and Home Rule,
831
Harvey, his opinion of Bacon, 575
his discovery, 576
Haselrig, attempted arrest of, 509
accused of corruption, 542
opposition of, to dissolution of
Parliament in favour of Council
of State, 543
returned to the Parliament of
1654, 549
his attitude in it, 549
excluded from the Parliament of
1657, 557
demands the dismissal of Fleet-
wood and Lambert, 559
Hasting, Danish leader, 48
Hastings ; see Battles
Hastings, Lord, his death, 283
Hastings, Warren, his policy, 734
his impeachment, 739, 740
its effect, 740
attitude of Pitt towards him, 740
effect of his trial, 740
Havelock, Sir Henry, 789, 816
Health, Royal Commission on (1845),
813
Hengest, 15 n.
lands in Kent, 7
his death, 7
Henry of Huntingdon, as an
authority, 33
Henry of Blois, as papal legate, 96
Henry the First of England, makes
terms with clergy, 84
seizes the crown, 84
his character, 84
his marriage, 84
his invasion of Normandy, 89
Henry the Second of England, his
character, 97
his policy, 98
his struggle with Becket, 99
his legal reforms, 99, 101-103
and Normandy and Maine, 104 n.
his death, 104
his treatment of Ireland, 415-417
Henry the Third of England, his
coronation, 122
rise of universities in his time,
123
his relations with Hubert de
Burgh, 134
refuses justice to Londoners, 135

- Henry the Third of England, his quarrel with the Earl Marshal, 136
his alliance with the Pope, 137
Henry the Fourth of France, his energy, 446
his conversion, 446
his opinion of James the First, 448
good effects of his policy, 635
Henry the Fourth of England, his insurrection against Richard the Second, 247
his accession, 248
policy towards the Church, 249
his struggle in Wales, 250
his death, 251
Henry the Fifth, his persecution of the Lollards, 251
his conquest of France, 251-255
effect of his death, 257
Henry the Sixth, effect of his long minority, 256
restrictive act passed under; *see* Commons, House of
his illness and recovery, 267
causes of his fall, 267
his restoration, 271
his death, 272
Henry the Seventh, his position as a sovereign, 284
his foreign policy, 291; *see* also Ireland
Henry the Eighth, his accession, 290
his marriage, 291
his foreign policy, 291
his sympathy with Colet, 295
his favour to More, 299
his despotic policy, 303; *see* also Ireland
his book against Luther, 304
circumstances of his divorce, 310
Wolsey's view of his character, 312
claim to be head of the Church, 316
his view about the translation of the Bible, 321
his relations with Cromwell, 322
his later career, 336
will of, 340 n.
effect of his character on Elizabeth, 350
Herbert, Lord, in Parliament of 1654, 549
Herbert Wake-dog, Count of Touraine, 93
Herbert, George, as a clergyman, 384
Herbert, Lord, of Cherbury, a friend of Hobbes, 581
Herford, Nicholas, a follower of Wyclif, 226
Herluin of Brienne, founds Abbey of Bec, 66
Hexham, priors of, historians of Stephen's reign, 109
Heywood, a successor of Shakspeare, 410
High Court of Commission; *see* Commission, High Court of
Hild, founds Whitby monastery, 25
Hill, Rowland, Penny Postage, 809
Hobbes, Thomas, his first work on Government, 581
his career and works, 581-583
Hoby, Sir Edward, 383
Holland, indignation in, at Charles the First's death, 536
war with, after Restoration, 594
hatred of Lewis the Fourteenth for, 602
alliance of, with England on behalf of Turkey, 748
absorbed by French Republic, 767
Holland, Lord, execution of, 537
Holles, attempted arrest of, 509
leadership of the Presbyterians, 528
expulsion from Parliament, 530
"Holy Alliance," 799
Home Rule, Gladstone's first bill (1886), 831
Gladstone's second bill, 834
Mr. Asquith's bill, 839
Home Rule League, 822
Hooke improves the microscope, 578
Hooker, Richard, as a clergyman, 384
as a writer, 398
his "Ecclesiastical Polity," 440
Hooper, execution of, 346
Hopton, Sir Ralph, a Royalist leader, 514
Horner helps to edit "Edinburgh Review," 778
Horne Tooke, his trial, 758
Horsa, coming of, 7
death of, 8
Horsted, its historical importance, 8
Hotham, Sir John, his refusal to admit the king to Hull, 511
Hotspur; *see* Northumberland
Hough, President of Magdalen College, 631
Hounslow, James's camp at, 630
House of Commons, Quakers, etc., permitted to enter, 805
House of Lords, veto, 838
Howard, Admiral Lord, 395
Howard, Lord, in Charles the First's time, presents petition for peace with Scotland, 500
Howard, John, 697
Howe, John, 589
refuses Declaration of Indulgence, 633
Howe, General, 730-731
Howel Dhu, laws of, 152
Hubert, Walter, effect of his death, 115
his execution of William Longbeard, 188
Hubert de Burgh, resists Lewis of France, 122
his character as a ruler, 133
opposes the Earl of Chester, 133
his fall, 134, 135
Huguenots, relations of Elizabeth of England to, 391

ne, Joseph, and parliamentary reform, 802
 nd state education, 805
 nd Anti-Corn Law Association, 812
 ndred Years' War, origin of, 216 n.
 skisson, 785
 ree Trade Policy, 799
 sey, Lord, his view of affairs in Henry the Eighth's reign, 326
 is execution, 327
 chinson, Colonel, account of him by his wife, 433, 434
 rs., her denunciation of James I.'s court, 456
 le, Edward, brings in a bill for making Long Parliament perpetual, 507
 ins the Royalist cause, 507
 sues State Papers for the king, 510
 aves Parliament after the resistance of Hotham to Charles, 511; *see* Clarendon
 seats Hales's bill for Church Comprehension, 587
 ERIAL DEFENCE, Committee of, 836
 pendent Labour Party, 837
 pendants, their assertion of freedom of belief, 589
 a, French empire in, 702
 conquest of, by England; *see* Clive
 forms in; *see* Clive
 egulation Act; *see* Statutes; *see* also Hastings (Warren) and Burke (Edmund)
 lls for government of; *see* Fox, Pitt (William the younger), Tip-poo Sahib, Wellesley, Battles
 ved by Convention of Cairo, 767
 feet of Affghan war upon, 787
 e mutiny and its results, 789, 790, 815-816
 King of Wessex, 34, 35
 cent the Third, his position, 115
 s relations with John, 115
 s suspension of Langton, 121
 s, monastery of, founded by Columba, 21
 ceives exiles from St. Aidan's, 28
 nd, revolts in, their effect on Spenser's life, 402
 ounstances of its conquest in the twelfth century, 415-418
 ruggles there, after the conquest by Strongbow, 417
 eatment of, by Henry the Seventh and Eighth, 419-421
 ect of the Reformation in, 423-424
 the Catholic reaction, 424-427
 nquest of, by Elizabeth, 427-429
 eatment of, by Strafford; *see* Wentworth
 aries the First appeals to, against England, 510

Ireland, Cromwell's conquest of; *see* Cromwell, Drogheda, Wexford
 effect on, of Charles the Second's policy, 597
 its soldiers, attempt of James II. to enrol them in his army, 642
 William's conquest of, 653-655
 asserts its independence in 1782, 735
 England's difficulty in Pitt's time, 744
 rising in, in 1798, 761
 its position under the Georges, 760, 761
 its state during the time of independence, 761
 Devon Commission, 821
 union of, with England; *see* Pitt; *see* also Grattan, Flood
 Church of, 21, 22
 its relation to English Church, 22
 effect on, of Synod of Whitby, 28
 Ireton, General, inclines to the Independents, 527
 his attitude towards the king, 530
 his share in the conquest of Ireland, 552
 body taken from the grave, 587
 Ironsides, their effect on the army, 528-529; *see* also Cromwell
 Isidore, Bishop, extracts of Bede from, 37
 Italy, rise of, 790
 JACOBINS led at first by the Girondins, 754
 their subsequent success and crimes, 755
 their fall, 757
 Jacobites, the, their plots against William the Third, 664
 against Anne, 673
 decline of their power under George the First, 680
 insurrection in 1715, 681, 682
 intrigued with by Cardinal Alberoni, 683
 Jacqueline of Brabant; *see* Gloucester, Duke Humphrey
 Jaenberht, Archbishop, his plot, 40
 James the First, his view of divine right of kings, 448
 of bishops, 449
 his relations to Parliament, 450-454, 461
 to the judges, 455, 456
 to his favourites, 456
 to Europe, 457-458
 to Bacon, 573
 James the Second, when Duke of York, made Lord Admiral, 584; *see* York, James, Duke of
 popular opinion of his character, 627
 servility of his first Parliament, 627
 his approval of cruelties after Sedgemoor, 628
 his relations with Lewis XIV., 629

- James the Second, fills his army with Roman Catholic officers, 629
 his attacks on the Church, 630, 631
 his struggle with the bishops, 634
 his flight and deposition, 643, 644
 James, William, a Lollard, 228
 Jameson, Dr., 835
 Jarrow, the monk of; *see* Bæda
 Jeffrey, edits "Edinburgh Review," 778
 Jeffreys, Judge, his "Bloody Circuit," 628
 his advice about the Seven Bishops, 634
 Jenkins, his ear, 689
 Jesuits, their success in England, 387; *see* Campian and Parsons
 Jews, their relations with William the First, 80
 their position in England at the Conquest, 80
 persecutions of, 192
 banished by Edward the First, 192
 restored by Cromwell, 553
 Joan of Arc, career of, 259-264
 Jocelyn, Bishop of Wells under John, 88
 John, the old Saxon, 47
 John, King of England, his conspiracy against Henry the Second, 104
 his treachery to Richard, 105
 his character and policy, 114
 his attitude towards the Pope, 115
 attitude towards the nobles, 116
 his reception of the demands of the nobles, 118
 attitude after Magna Charta, 121
 his death, 122
 his treatment of Ireland, 418
 Johnson, Samuel, a friend of Burke's, 749
 Johnston of Warriston suggests the renewal of the Covenant, 497
 Jonson, Ben, his account of Spenser's death, 402
 his view of Shakspeare's character, 407
 "Every Man in his Humour," 409
 succeeds Shakspeare as king of the stage, 413
 his estimate of Bacon, 573
 friendship for Hobbes, 581
 Joseph the Second of Austria, motive and character of his policy, 746
 his death, 748
 Junius, prosecution of, 721
 his letters, 725
 Junto, the Whig, 659
 Justiciar, appointment of, 90
 Jutes, 6 n.
 their position in England, 1, 2
 their invasion of England, 7
 their Kentish kingdom; *see* Kent
 Juxon, Bishop, made Treasurer, 479
 KEBEL, execution of, 88
 Kent, rise of kingdom of, 18
 struggles with Northumbria, 18
 Kent, insurrection of, against Mercia, 39
 subjection of, to Wessex, 40
 revolts against Odo of Bayeux, 75
 Kent, Earl of, his execution, 201
 Kepler, a contemporary of Bacon, 576
 Khartoum, 831
 Khedive, 830-831
 Killicrankle, battle of, 647
 Killigrew, his rebuke to Charles the Second, 595
 King, Locke, 817
 Kingship, English, change in its character, 54
 Kitchener, General, 835
 Knolles, his history of the Turks, 377
 Knollys, his opinion of Mary Stuart, 362
 Knox, his resistance to Mary, 363
 Kruger, President, 835
 "LABOUR CORRESPONDENT" (Board of Trade), 834
 Labourdonnais, General, in India, 708
 Labourers, Statutes of; *see* Peasantry
 "Labourers' Revolt," last, 801, 802
 Labour Party, Independent, 837
 Labour Representation Committee, 837
 Lally, General, his defeat, 732
 Lambert, General, employed by Fairfax, 533
 resigns his commission to Cromwell, 558
 his conduct after Cromwell's death, 561
 excepted from general pardon, 565
 Lambeth, treaty of, 123
 Lancaster, Thomas, Earl of, his relations with Gaveston, 195
 his defeat and death, 196
 Lancaster, Duke of; *see* Gaunt, John of
 Lancaster, House of; *see* Henry the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth
 Land, tenure of, by Norman barons after Conquest, 78
 taxes, 838
 Lanfranc, of Pavla, enters the Abbey of Bec, 66
 opposes William, 71
 banished from Normandy, 71
 becomes William's chief adviser, 71
 summoned to England, 79
 his reforms; *see* Church of England
 assists Rufus to gain the crown, 82
 effect of his death, 83
 Langton, Stephen, 115, 118
 election of, and council of St. Paul's, 119 n.
 his suspension from his archbishopric, 121
 his attitude in Henry the Third's reign, 133

ington, Simon, his advice to the
 Barons, 122
 ington, Walter, Bishop of Wor-
 cester, 293
 imer, Hugh, his autobiography,
 309, 331
 is preaching, 331
 is first arrest, 332
 made Bishop of Worcester, 332
 is treatment of a figure of the
 Virgin, 333
 nprisoned and deposed, 334
 rested under Six Articles Act,
 337
 nprisoned on Mary's accession,
 341
 is execution, 346
 imer, Lord, removed from office,
 220 [293]
 imer, William, studies at Padua,
 itudinarians, growth of, 579-581
 d, his intolerance, 441
 is list of ministers, 463
 is character and policy, 476-480
 is treatment of Scotland, 489-492
 is feelings about "Thorough,"
 495
 is courage, 495
 nprisonment of, 503
 neck on his power, 588
 derdale, Lord, his rule in Scot-
 land, 598
 zun, his taunt against the Irish
 defenders of Limerick, 654
 's, Bonar, 848
 's, Roman, its influences in Ed-
 ward the First's reign, 171
 rence, Sir Henry, and India, 815
 amon, his poem, 113
 h, commissioner about the
 monasties, 321
 uester, Earl of; *see* Montfort,
 Simon de
 uester, Earl of, Elizabeth's
 favourite, 350, 355
 ighton the Puritan, 494
 nox, Duke of, presents petitions
 against English Prayer Book in
 Scotland, 496
 thall, his answer to Charles the
 First, 509
 the Tenth, his election, 293
 is view of Luther, 303
 twine, son of Godwine, 73
 pold, the Emperor, interferes
 against France, 753
 le, General, takes command of
 Scotch forces, 495
 nduct at Dunbar, 539
 ken prisoner at Worcester, 541
 es, battle of; *see* Battles
 is the Seventh of France, his
 struggle with Henry II., 99
 is, son of Philip Augustus, after-
 wards Lewis the Eighth, his in-
 vasion of England, 122
 s retreat from England, 123
 is the Ninth, his decision about
 the Provisions of Oxford, 146

Lewis the Ninth, his influence on
 Edward the First, 172
 Lewis the Fourteenth, his indigna-
 tion at William of Orange's
 marriage, 613
 his pensions to Charles the Second,
 613
 effect on his position of the treaty of
 Nimeguen, 613
 his relations with James the
 Second, 620
 his revocation of the Edict of
 Nantes, 629
 his character, 636
 his policy, 636, 637
 his war against the allies, 646
 his intrigues about the Spanish
 succession, 661, 662
 his treachery to William the Third,
 663; *see* also Holland, William
 of Orange, Arlington, Dover,
 treaty of
 Lewis the Fifteenth, the freedom of
 opinion in France under him,
 746
 Lewis the Sixteenth, convokes the
 States-General, 748
 accepts the Constitution, 748
 flies from Paris, 753
 his imprisonment, 754
 his death, 755
 Lewis the Eighteenth, his flight from
 Paris, 781
 Leyton, Commissioner of Monas-
 teries, 321
 Licensing Bill, 838
 Lilburne, John, 537, 539
 Lilla saves Radwine from a murderer,
 18
 Lilly, an Oxford scholar, 294
 Limerick, sick of, 654
 Linacre of Oxford, 287-289
 Lincoln, in time of Romans, 4
 Jews' houses at, 80
 Stephen defeated at, 85
 welcomes the Barons, 118
 Lincoln, Bishop of, his relations with
 University of Oxford, 128
 Lindisfarne, bishopric of, 21
 desertion of it by Colman, 28
 Cuthbert becomes its bishop, 32
 its historical importance, 33
 Lisle, Lady, executed, 828
 Literature, English; *see* England,
 literature of
 Literature, Welsh, in twelfth and
 thirteenth centuries, 150-152,
 154, 155
 Liverpool, Lord, his ministry, 776
 Livery companies; *see* Companies,
 Livery
 Llewellyn of Wales, his alliance with
 Faukes de Breauté, 133
 Llewellyn-ap-Jowerth, his struggles
 for independence, 154-156
 Llewellyn-ap-Gruffydd, his struggles
 for independence, 156, 157
 Lloyd George, Budget of 1909, In-
 surance Act, 838

Llywarch Hen; *see* Literature, Welsh
 Local government, 832
 Locke, John, his political teaching, 583
 Lollardy, revival of, and its suppression, 209
 meaning of name, 227
 struggle of, 227
 later phases of 243-244
 protection of, by Richard the Second, 246
 persecution of, by Henry IV and Henry V., 249
 state of, in Henry the Sixth's reign, 258
 signs of its extinction, 266
 persecution of, its effect on Henry the Sixth, 268
 effect on of Oldcastle's execution, 330
 Lothian becomes abode of Scotch kings, 51
 London, its early commerce, 5
 plundered by Danes, 42
 relations of Normans and French to, 85-86
 shares in the religious revival of the twelfth century, 88
 welcomes Stephen, 94
 supports him, 94
 welcomes the Barons, 118
 faithful to Protestantism on Mary's accession, 342
 its sympathy with the Long Parliament, 507
 London, John of, a pupil of Roger Bacon, 130
 Londonderry, foundation of, 429
 siege of, 649
 Longchamp, William, Bishop of Ely, makes an alliance between Otho and Richard, 106
 Longland, William, his history, 240
 his poem, 241
 Lords, House of, weakened by suppression of mitred abbots, 329; *see also* Parliament
 Louis XIV., wife's renunciation of claim to Spanish throne, 676 n.
 Louis Philippe, 786
 Luddites, riots of, 784
 Ludlow, General, his share in the conquest of Ireland, 552
 Luneville, treaty of, 767
 Luther, his change of attitude, 303
 his relation to the Revival of Letters, 304
 reception of his doctrines in England, 304; *see* Leo, More
 advises Tyndale to translate the Bible, 330
 Luttrell, Colonel, 724
 Lydgate, his character as a poet, 277
 Lyly, his "Euphues," 378
 Lyons, William, removed from court, 220
 Lyttelton leaves Long Parliament, 511

MABINOGI, 151
 Macdonald, Ramsay, 848 ff.
 Mackay, General, his struggle against Dundee, 647
 Mackintosh, Sir James, his exclamation about the state of Europe under Buonaparte, 768, 769
 helps in "Edinburgh Review," 778
 Macmillan, Harold, 865
 Magdalene College; *see* Parker, Gifford, Hough, etc.
 Magna Carta and restriction of royal revenue, 123 n.
 Mahdi, 830-831
 Maine submits to Duke William, 70
 Major-Generals, Cromwell's, 557
 Malcolm, his submission to William the First, 77
 to Rufus, 84
 Malger, Archbishop of Rouen, 71
 Malpighi, helps to found vegetable physiology, 578
 Malta, treatment of, by England, 768
 Manchester, its Toryism in 1745, 700
 Manchester, Earl of, leads parliamentary forces, 515
 Cromwell quarrels with, 518; *see also* Cromwell
 Mandeville, Lord, a leader of the Presbyterians, 508
 Manny, Walter de, 214, 233
 Mansel, a royal favourite of Henry the Third, 139
 Mantes, burning of, by William the First, 82
 Manton, his scheme of Protestant comprehension, 601
 Mareschal, Earl William, his power on death of John, 122
 Mareschal, Earl Richard, his resistance to Henry, 136
 Margaret of Anjou, her marriage, 264
 Marlborough, Duke of, his exploits in Ireland, 654
 his plots against William the Third, 656 [667
 his early career and character, 665-
 his rise in power under Anne, 666-668
 wins Blenheim, 669
 the rest of his career, 671-676
 his opinion of Walpole, 677
 Marlborough, Duchess of, her influence over Anne, 666
 over her husband, 666
 Marlowe, 405, 406
 Marmont, Marshal, 774
 Marsh, Adam, his reputation as a scholar, 141
 his relations to Grosseteste and de Montfort, 142
 Marshall, a Presbyterian minister, 508 [410
 Marston, a successor of Shakspeare, Marston Moor; *see* Battles
 Martin, a Papal collector driven from England, 137
 Martin, Henry, 537
 Martin Marprelate, 443

tyr, Peter, burning of his bones, 348
 tyrs; *see* Latimer, Taylor, Ridley, Cranmer, etc.
 ry Tudor, set aside by Edward, 341
 er marriage, 342
 er courage at the insurrection, 343
 er policy, 344
 iscontent with her rule, 348
 er death, 348
 ersecution, 348 *n.*
 ry Stuart, her birth, effects of, 360
 er claims, 360
 er character, 362
 er marriage and its effects, 364-366
 er career in England, 367-370
 er death, 392-394
 ry de Medicis, her position in France, 390
 sham, Mrs., 676
 sachussets, attacks on the liberty of, 727
 sacre of 1641, 511 *n.*
 ssena, Marshal, 774
 sey made Dean of Christ Church, 631
 singer contrasted with Ben Jonson, 413
 ida of Flanders, her marriage, 71
 ispute about it with the Pope, 71
 ida, wife of Henry the First, 85
 id, Henry's daughter, loved by him, 91
 er struggle with Stephen, 94
 ircle, Prince, his successes in Devonshire, 515
 irlus takes the place of Malger as Archbishop of Rouen, 71
 y, his account of the atrocities of the Irish, 506
 iflower, the, its voyage, 474
 arin, Cardinal, his alliance with Cromwell, 356
 ina Sidonia, leads the Armada, 396, 397 *n.*
 bourne, Lord, his ministry, 786
 litus, Bishop of London, 20
 ville, his treatment of James the First, 490
 oia, colonization of, 14
 aganism of, 20
 hakes off the overlordship of Northumbria, 20, 21
 had's mission to, 23
 s conquests in time of Penda, 23
 ffect on, of Theodore's arrangements, 29
 reat progress of, in later part of seventh century, 29-31
 ise of, after fall of Northumbria, 33-35
 ower of, under Offa, 38
 s fall, 40
 ictories over Danes under Æthelred, 48
 s relations to Wales, 152

Meres, Francis, "Wit's Treasury," 408, 409
 his opinion of Shakspeare, 410
 Methodists, the, 695
 Mexico, attack of France on, 790
 Middle-English; *see* English, their settlements in Britain
 Middlesex election; *see* Wilkes, Luttrell
 Middleton, as successor of Shakspeare, 410
 Mill, J. S., and women suffrage, 818
 and Irish Land Act, 821
 Milner, Sir Alfred, 835
 Milton, John, his Puritanism, 435
 his early career, 492, 493
 his first poems, 493
 his relation to Spinoza, 493
 his "Lycidas," 497
 sonnet on Massacre of Vaudois, 555
 his career as illustrative of Puritanism, 562, 563
 "Paradise Lost" and "Paradise Regained," and "Samson Agonistes," 563-565
 efforts for freedom of the press, 625
 Monasteries, rise of, in Northumbria, 25
 Monk, General, reduces the Highlands, 552
 circumstances of his restoration of Charles the Second, 561
 Monks, attacks of Erasmus, Colet, Thomas Cromwell, More on, 321
 Monmouth, Duke of, brought forward by Shaftesbury, 618
 progress through the country, 623
 his arrest, 623
 his flight, 624
 his insurrection, defeat, and death, 627, 628
 Montacute besieged, 76
 Montagu, his sermons before Parliament, 463
 Montagu, made Earl of Sandwich by Charles the Second, 584
 Montagu, a member of Whig Junto, 659
 becomes Chancellor of Exchequer, 659
 his financial reforms, 659
 driven from office, 662
 Montaigne, point of similarity between him and Shakspeare, 412
 Montcalm, General, 711, 712
 Monteagle, Lord, the letter to, 446
 Montesquieu, his account of religious state of England, 693
 his work in France, 747
 Montfort, Simon de, his relations to the Roman Church, 139
 the king's fear of him, 134
 his career in Gascony, 134
 his share in the Provisions of Oxford, 145
 his siege of Dover, 146
 the rest of his career, 146-149
 his admiration for Edward the First, 171

- Montgomery, minister of William I., 78
- Montrose, Earl of, his desertion of the patriots, 505
organizes a rising in favour of Charles the First, 505
defeats Argyle, 521
- Moore, Sir John, his career in Portugal, 772
- Moravians, Wesley's relations with, 696
- More, Mrs. Hannah, her account of absence of Bibles in England, 693
effect of her writing, 697
- More, Sir Thomas, his allusion to Vespucci, 287
his character, 289
his opinion of Colet's school, 294
his career, 297-299
his "Utopia," 299-301
his answer to Luther, 304
his opinion of Wolsey, 306
as Chancellor, 315, 316
his attacks on the monks, 321
his death, 324, 325
influence of his doctrines, 580
- Morkere of Northumbria, supports Edgar the Atheling, 75
reduced to submission by William I., 77
- Morley, John, and Home Rule, 831
- Morpeth, Lord, and public health, 813
- Morrison, Robert, a botanist, 578
- Mortimer, Roger, his career, 201
- Mortimer, House of, its claims in the Lancastrian times, 252, 256
- Moscow, retreat of, 776
- Mountjoy, his rule in Ireland, 428
- Mountmorris, his treatment by Wentworth, 488
- Mowbray, Roger, rewarded by William I. with grants of lands, 78
- Mowbray, Earl of Northumberland, captured by Rufus, 83
- Mundella, M., compulsory education, 828
Board of Trade Labour Department, 834
Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 833
- Municipal Corporation Act, 807, 808
- Murray, Earl of, leads the Lords of the Congregation, 364
made Regent, 367
- Mutiny Act; *see* Statutes
- NAPIER, SIR CHARLES, and India, 815
- Napoleon: *see* Buonaparte
- Navigation laws relaxed, 799
- "Near East," 826-828
- Nelson, Admiral; *see* Battles, Villeneuve
- Newcastle, Treaty of (1334), 203 *n.*
- Newcastle, Duke of, his ignorance of the intrigues of Austria and Russia, 702
his incapacity, 703
- Newcastle, Duke of, his corruption, 703
his quarrel with Pitt, 717
- Newton, Sir Isaac, his work, 578
- Newton, the Evangelical, 696
- Nicholson, 816
- Nightingale, Miss Florence, 815
- Nimeguen, treaty of, 613
- Nonconformists, effect on of the St. Bartholomew's Day of 1662, 588-590; *see* Presbyterians, Methodists, Quakers
- Norfolk, Earl of, rebels against William the First, 81; *see* also Bigod, Earl
- Norfolk, Duke of, his share in Henry the Eighth's divorce, 315
arrests Thomas Cromwell, 336
expectations from the Emperor, 337
- Norfolk, Duke of, his treason against Elizabeth, 369, 370
- Norfolk, Duke of, his answer to James the Second, 632
- Normandy described, 65
civilization of, 66
condition of, under William I., 69
conquest of, by Henry V., 253-254
- Normans, settlement in France, 65
conquests of, 68
blending of, with England; *see* English
- North, Lord, his protest against cruelties of James II., 628
- North, Lord, in George the Third's time, his servility to the king, 724
stirred up by Clive to inquire into India, 732
his resignation, 735
its effect, 737
his coalition with Fox, 738; *see* also America, Boston, Massachusetts
- Northallerton; *see* Battles
- Northampton, treaty of, 201
- Northampton, John of, 243
- Northumberland, Earl of, in Henry the Fourth's reign, his rising and that of his son, 250
- Northumberland, Duke of, his career, 340-341
- Northumberland, Earl of, rebels against Elizabeth, 369
effect of her treatment of him, 370
- Northumbria, establishment of a kingdom there, 15
history of it till its conversion, 16-20
its fall, 33
its anarchy after its fall, 38; *see* also Æthelrith, Æthelbert, Eadwine, Cuthbert, Oswald, Oswi, Whitby, Bæda, Cædmon
- Norwich, separate French colony in, 86
- Nothelm, his assistance to Bæda, 37
- Nottingham, Lord, his opposition to Marlborough, 671
- Nottingham, peace of, 43

- all, Dean, Elizabeth's treatment of him, 358
his revival of ship-money, 484
- as, Titus, his plot, 613-615
pension, 652
- er, Richard, "Ten Hours" agitation, 805
th of Salisbury, 81 n.
- en, Smith, his insurrection, 788
vo as a poet, 277
- am, William of, his rank as a schoolman, 141
effect on Wyclif, 221
- nnell, Daniel, his agitation for Catholic Emancipation, 786
ect of his violence, 786
"Repeal" agitation, 787
arrest, 788
- inds Catholic Association, 800
Archbishop, makes peace with Danelagh, 50
- i Wulfstan's treaty, 56 n.
of Bayeux left in charge of England, 75
tyranny, 75
warded by a grant of manors, 78
els against William I., 81
arrest, 81
els against Rufus, 83
king of Mercia, his rule, 38-39, 41 n.
relations with Charles the Great, 39-40
ke, 41 n.
- horpe, General, founds Georgia, 713
- astle, Sir John, 251
- urman, 831
- ills, the, 426, 427
- gemen, their cruelties in Ireland, 763
- go River Free State, self-government in, 837
- ricus Vitalis, as an authority, 65
- ns, Duke of, his intrigues in France, 251
- ns, siege of; see Joan of Arc
- nd invites Charles the First to Ireland, 536
- de Duke and Steward by Charles the Second, 584
- us, translation of, by Ælfred, 47
- ld, king of Northumbria, 21, 33 n.
- ls missionaries unto Northumbria, 21
ect of his victories, 27
king of Northumbria, 23, 33 n.
ect of his victories, 27
sides at Synod of Whitby, 27
the Emperor, his alliance with John at Bouvines, 117
the Papal legate, 137
am, 816
t, Robert, 817
d, medical school of Jews at, 80
tilda's escape from, 95
visions of, 144-146
- Oxford, University of, its early history, 124
lectures of Vacarius at, 124
description of its early appearance, 124
Normans and Gascons come to, after divisions at Paris, 127
Chancellor of, his position in the thirteenth century, 128
takes place of University of Paris, 221
the centre of Lollardry, 227
degeneracy of learning at, in the fifteenth century, 278
its zeal for Charles the First, 513
Oxford, Earl of, Henry the Seventh's treatment of him, 286
Oxford, Earl of, Burleigh's son-in-law, turns Roman Catholic, 387
- PADUA, importance of its University in the thirteenth century, 127
- Paine, Thomas, Pitt's opinion of him, 757
- Palmerston, Lord, his career, 787-790
and Prusso-Danish War, 817
- Paris, Matthew, 137
- Paris, University of, its importance in the thirteenth century, 124, 125, 127
its reputation transferred to Oxford, 221
treatment of, in Cranmer's canvass, 316
- Paris, treaty of, 735
- Paris, city of, rules France in 1792, 754
- Parish, origin of, 29
- Parish Councils Bill, 834
- Parker, Matthew, made Archbishop of Canterbury, 357
his object, 357
his effect on the clergy, 358
his enforcement of uniformity, 441
- Parker, the Roman Catholic president of Magdalene College, 632
- Parliament Act (1911), 838
- Parliamentary reform, 802, 817, 831
- Parliaments, rise of, 159, 162-164
position of, in time of Edward the Third, 217-220
attacks of, on the Pope, 222
decline of, under Lancastrians; see Commons, House of
claims of, to regulate succession after fall of Henry the Sixth, 268
importance of, under Edward the Fourth, 273
their relations with the Tudors, 380-383
their feeling about Protestantism 343, 390
their struggle against James the First, 450-454, 458-461
their struggle against Charles the First; see Eliot, Pym, Hampden, Wentworth, etc.

- Parliaments, "the Drunken Parliament" in Edinburgh, 598
reports of debates, 725, 726
property qualification abolished, 817
Jews admitted to, 858
of Ireland; *see* Ireland
Acts of; *see* Statutes
- Parnell, 829
"Parnellism and Crime," 832
- Parsons, the Jesuit, 387, 388
- Paston, letters of, 278
- Paterson suggests schemes of a national bank, 659
- Patrick, his mission to Ireland, 21
- "Patriots," the, oppose Walpole, 687
- Paulinus goes to Northumbria, 18
his conversion of Eadwine, 19
his flight from Northumbria, 20
conquers land of West Saxons, 30
- Peace Preservation Act (Ireland), 821
- Peasantry, revolt of, 248 n., 249 n.; *see* Tyler, Wat
condition of, in early times, 230
first alterations in their condition, 232
their struggle to attain a higher condition, 233
effect on them of Statutes of Labourers, 234
John Ball preaches to them; *see* Ball, John
subsequent struggles of, after Tyler's time, 241, 242
- Peckham, Archbishop, his reputation as a scholar, 142
- Peel, Sir Robert, supports the Wellington Ministry, 786
becomes Prime Minister, 786
his policy about free trade, 788, 812
at Home Office, 801
Budget of 1842, 811
- Pelham, Henry, his rise, 698
his fall, 701
- Pelham, the, contrasted with Walpole, 687
- Penericche, Richard, a teacher in reign of Edward the Third, 204
- Penda, his struggle against Northumbria, 20, 22, 23, 33 n
- Penn, William, colonizes Pennsylvania, 713
- Penny postage, 809
- Pepys, his account of the change of feeling towards Cromwell in England, 595
his opinion of Charles II., 595
of the Triple Alliance, 602
of Shaftesbury, 607
- Perceval, Spencer, becomes Prime Minister, 773
his resistance to America, 775
his death, 777
- Perrers, Alice, her influence at court of Edward the Third, 220
- Perth, convention of, 197
- Peterborough, abbey of, founded by Wulfere, 31
burnt by Danes, 43
- Peterloo, 797-798
- Peters, Hugh, his justification of Pride's Purge, 534
- Petition, Millenarv, 447
of Right, 468, 469
- Petitioners and Abhorrrers, 620
- Petre, Father, called to Privy Council, 632
- Petty, Sir William, an economist, 577
- Pevensey, William I. lands at, 73
- Philip Augustus, his relations with John, 105
his effect on Arthur's cause, 107
Philip the Second of Spain, his marriage; *see* Mary
perceives hopelessness of persecution in England, 317
puzzled at Elizabeth's power, 350
Elizabeth's use of, 355
his character as a statesman, 388
- Philips, Sir Robert, his speeches against Charles the First, 464
- Picts, the, 6
their league with the Britons, 6
their defeat by the English, 8
- Piers the Ploughman, vision of, 210
248 n.; *see* also Longland
- Pilgrimage of grace, 326
- Pillnitz, conference of, 753
- Pitt, William, the elder, leads the "Boys," 689
his career in office, 703-707
effects of it, 712
effects of his assistance to Frederick, 715
George II.'s dislike of him, 717
his fall, 717
his refusal to return to office, 722
approves the resistance of America, 722; *see* also Chatham, Earl of
- Pitt, William, the younger, his first appearance in Parliament, 737
moves for Parliamentary reform, 737
struggle against the coalition, 738
his India Bill, 739
treatment of Warren Hastings, 740
compared with Walpole, 741
his answer to Fox about his policy towards France, 741
his financial policy, 741, 744
failure of his Bill for Parliamentary Reform, 743, 744
attitude about the slave trade, 745
about the regency, 747
about the French Revolution and about Prussia, 747-749
his hopes from France, 750
his opposition to Burke, 751
supports Fox's Label Bill, 752
defeats plots of the French emigrants, 753
struggles for peace, 754
his change of policy, 755
attempts to make peace with France, 760

- William, the younger, his relations with Ireland, 760-764
 in the peerage, 764, 765
 in the Roman Catholics, 765
 resignation, 767
 death, 770
 Francis, 799, 802
 in Charles the Second's time, 594; *see also* Black Death
 agenet, origin of the name, 94
 toll, Samuel, load-line, 824
 kett, Sir Horace, 835
 io, his view of English literature, 278
 ers, battle of, 216 n
 id, relation of, to Protestantism, 144
 nsions of, 748, 756
 Reginald, his view of Henry the Eighth's character, 290
 advice to Wolsey, 317
 de Cardinal, 327
 ical Register; *see* Cobbett
 ck, General, his Afghan expedition, 788
 ; *see* Statutes, Peasantry
 Law Commission (1834), 806
 09), Report of, 837, 838
 Law Reform, 787
 , claims of, on England, 80
 acks of Ockham and Wyclif
 on, 221-223
 r, John, in Bonner's time, 431
 eeve, his position in time of Henry the First, 86
 outh, Duchess of, supports the Exclusion Bill, 621
 presence at Charles the Second's death-bed, 627
 ical, relations of, with Spain and England, 600
 atment of, at treaty of Fontenoy, 772
 ellesley's opinion of, 773
 ellesley's campaign in, 773, 774
 urre, Statute of, *see* Statutes
 natic Sanction, 685
 ic, University of, Wyclif's writings brought to it; *see* Wyclif
 ysterianism, attitude of leaders of Long Parliament to it, 438
 atment of, in Scotland by Laud, 189, 490
 wth of, 505
 ysterians, their struggle against the Independents, 526, 527
 ir relations with Usher, 587
 et of their expulsion from Church of England, 589
 ir attitude at time of Scotch Act of Union, 590
 , liberty of, attacked by Grenville, 720
 wth of its power, 725, 726
 nder, the old, 682
 nder, the young, 700
 ria, convention of, 828
 , Colonel, his purge, 534
 Prior, Matthew, his satires on the Allies, 675
 Proportional representation, 818
 Protestantism, history of, during Elizabeth's reign, 444, 445
 Protestants; *see* Lollardry, Latimer, Cromwell (Thomas), Cranmer
 Elizabeth's attitude towards, 351, 353, 356
 growth of their position in Elizabeth's reign, 384
 growth of their clergy, 384
 Provisors; *see* Statutes
 Prussia, relations of, with England, 746-748
 rises against Napoleon, 779; *see also* Frederick the Second
 Prusso-Danish War, 817
 Prynne, his "Histrio-mastrix," 494
 his trial and punishment, 494
 Public Health Act (1875), 824
 Pulteney leads opposition to Walpole, 687
 becomes Earl of Bath, 698
 Puritanism, its effect on England, 379
 growth in Elizabethan times, 412
 hatred of its professors for the stage, 414
 its effect on the people, 432-434
 distinct from Presbyterianism, 438; *see also* Laud
 fall of, 560-566
 causes of its fall, 568, 569
 its effect on the history of England, 746
 Puritans, their first settlement in America, 472
 their ideal, 568
 wish for uniformity of belief, 589
 their influence on the United States, 714
 Pym, his feelings towards Episcopacy, 438
 his first election, 454
 his speech about the Petition of Right, 469
 his character and position, 501
 brings in the Grand Remonstrance, 507, 508
 his views on Church Reform, 508
 attempted arrest of, 509
 his attitude after Charles the First's attempt to arrest five members, 510
 determines to ally the Long Parliament with Scotland, 515
 his last plans, 518, 517
 effect of his death on Cromwell's position, 518
 his body taken from the grave, 587
 his influence on Finance, 686
 QUADRUPLE ALLIANCE, the, 683
 Quakers, the, protected by Cromwell, 553
 their assertion of freedom of belief, 589
 special persecution of them, 591

- Queen Victoria, accession, 808
 proclaimed sovereign of India, 816
 proclamation to India, 816
 becomes Empress of India, 825
 Jubilee, 832
 death of, 835
 Quo warranto, writs of, 190
- RÆDWALD, King of East Anglia, 16
 his inconsistency in religion, 20
 his opposition to Christianity, 22
 Rahere builds St. Bartholomew's
 priory, 89
 Raikes, his Sunday Schools, 697
 Railways, Stockton and Darlington
 opened, 810
 development of, 811
 Raleigh, Sir Walter, "History of the
 World," 377
 his account of Spenser, 399
 failure of his last expedition, 458
 his discovery of Virginia, tobacco,
 and potatoes, 473
 Ray, John, his scientific works, 578
 Reciprocity Act, 799
 Redcliffe, Lord Stratford de, and
 Crimean War, 815
 Redistribution Bill, 831
 Reform Act (1832), 803
 Reformation, its effect in separating
 off the English Church from
 others, 589
 Reform Bill (1866), 818
 Reform of Parliament; *see* Com-
 mons, House of
 Remonstrance, the Short, 469-472
 the Grand, 507
 Repynndon, his sermons, 227
 Reresby, his opinion of Charles the
 Second, 619
 Reynolds, Sir Joshua, his friendship
 for Burke, 749
 Rhodes, Cecil, 835
 Rich, Edmund, story of, 126
 support of the Earl Mareschal, 136
 Richard the First of England, his
 character, 105
 his policy, 105
 his treatment of Scotland, 175
 Richard the Second, effect of his
 accession, 235
 his attitude in Tyler's insurrec-
 tion, 238
 after it, 239
 takes power into his own hands,
 245
 effects of his policy, 245, 246
 his fall, 247
 and the Beauforts, 272 n.
 his treatment of Ireland, 419
 Richard the Third, his seizure of the
 throne, 282
 his policy, 283
 his death, 284
 Richard the Fearless, Duke of Nor-
 mandy, 66
 Richardson, Chief Justice, Laud's
 quarrel with, 478
 Richborough, fortress of, 3
- Richelleu, effects of his policy, 635
 Richmond, Duke of, his advocacy of
 Universal Suffrage, 743
 Ridley, his execution, 346
 Rivers, Lord, his literary ability, 281
 Rizzio, his career, 365
 Robert Guiscard, 68
 Robert, Duke of Normandy, 68
 his pilgrimage, 69
 Robert, son of William the First,
 rebels against his father, 82
 Normandy bequeathed to, 82
 continual rebellion in his name
 against Rufus, 83
 sells Normandy to Rufus, 84
 goes to Crusades, 84
 his return, 84
 heads a rebellion against Henry
 the First, 89
 Robert of Belesme rebels against
 Henry the First, 89
 Roberts, Lord, 835
 Robespierre, Maximilian, opposes
 war, 754
 his fall, 757
 Robinson, John, the Separatist, 443
 his voyage, 474
 Rochelle, fall of, 470
 Rochester, siege of, by William
 Rufus, 83
 Rochester, Lord, his profligate poems,
 569
 Rochester, Bishopric of, what it re-
 presented, 29
 Rockingham, Lord, inclines to Pitt,
 720
 his ministry, 736
 his dislike of Parliamentary Re-
 form, 737
 makes peace, 737
 his death, 738
 effect of his reforms, 738
 Rodney, Admiral, effect of his vic-
 tory, 735
 Roger de Toesny, 68, 70
 Roger of Hoveden as a chronicler, 110
 Roger, Guiscard's brother, 68
 Rogers, execution of, 345
 Rohese, mother of Becket, 96
 Rolf the Ganger, his conquests in
 France, 65
 Rome, relations of, with Britain, 5, 6
 influence of, in Church, 28-33
 Romney secured by William the
 Conqueror, 74
 Romsey, Matilda educated in
 nunnery at, 85
 Rookwood, Elizabeth, 386
 Rosebery, Lord, 834, 838
 Rossbach, battle of; *see* Battles
 Rousseau expresses moral con-
 ceptions of his time, 747
 Roxburgh, Treaty of (1332), 203 n.
 Royal Society founded, 577
 Royal Titles Bill (1876), 825
 Rudyard, Sir Benjamin, his hopes
 from Charles the First, 463
 "Rump," the; *see* Commonwealth,
 Cromwell Vane Martin

- rt, Prince, his exploits in the civil wars, 513, 514, 515
 flight after Marston Moor, 517
 conduct at Naseby, 522
 all, family of, rise of, from the spoil of the monasteries, 329
 all, Lord, helps to head the Country Party, 605
 all, William, Lord, his support of Shaftesbury in the Exclusion Bill, 619
 trial and execution, 624
 all, Admiral, his intrigues with James the Second, 656
 defeat of the French at La Hogue, 656
 de Secretary of the Admiralty, 159
 all, Lord John, his first ministry, '88, 789
 second ministry, 790
 ices reform of Parliament, 790
 a, rise of, under Catherine the Second, 748
 gland's war with, 789
 -Turkish War (1878), 827
 e, Chancellor of Oxford, 228
 ick, Peace of, 660
- EVERELL, Dr., 676
 ille, his "Gorboduc," 403
 r, Michael, and "Ten Hours" agitation, 805
 ury, John of, his holiness of life, 89
 fame at Paris, 125
 ury, Roger of, his arrest by Stephens, 95
 ury, Earl of, a leader of Boliards, 247
 death, 247
 ury, Countess of, her death, 313
 ury, Lord, third ministry, 834
 ; see St.
 oft, Archbishop, protests against Declaration of Indulgence, 634
 Domingo, taking of, 556
 River convention, 825-826
 ation, public, 813
 eld, General, in Ireland, 654
 e, William, his execution, 250
 e, Sir John, his rivalry with Ventworth, 486
 e, Sir Henry, 460
 e, Duke of, treatment of, by Cromwell, 555
 e; see Sautre
 as, their settlement in England, -2
 as, East and West, their colonies, 14; see also East Saxons, Essex, Wessex
 as, South, their kingdoms, 10
 and Sele, Lord, a leader of the Presbyterians, 608
 le Lord Privy Seal, 584
 iberg, General, in Ireland, 653
 e, annexation of, 788
- Scotland, its treatment by William the First, 82
 struggles of, against England up to time of Wallace, 172-180
 its state at accession of Elizabeth, 358-360
 its treatment by Laud, 489, 491
 effect on it of Charles the Second's policy, 598
 its treatment by James II., 630
 union of, with England, 672, 673
 Scots, King of, invested with fief of Cumberland, 51
 Scots, the, absorbed by English, 51
 Scrope, Archbishop of York, his insurrection and death, 250
 Sedley, Sir Charles, 569
 Separatists, the, 442
 September, Massacres of, 755
 Serf; see Peasantry
 Seringapatam, capture of, 759
 Shaftesbury, Lord, his taunts against the queen, 597
 discovery of Charles's perfidy, 606
 his policy at court, 606-609
 causes of his being driven from office, 609
 his subsequent policy, 609
 his first sketch of the Exclusion Bill, 610
 sent to the Tower by Danby, 612
 takes up the Popish Plot, 614
 is made Lord Treasurer after Danby's fall, 616
 championship of Monmouth, 618
 his second dismissal from office, 619
 his later policy, 619-622
 his Bill of Divorce, 621
 his flight and death, 623
 Shaftesbury, Lord, and public health, 813
 Shakspere, highest type of Elizabethan literature, 398
 scantiness of information about him, 406, 407
 his "Venus and Adonis," 408
 his dramas, 408-413
 his sympathy with the insurrection of Essex, 410
 George the Third's opinion of, 715
 Shane O'Neill, 426, 427
 Shaxton, Bishop of Salisbury, 332
 his imprisonment, 332
 Shelburne, Lord, leads the Chatham party, 737
 his ministry, 738
 Sheldon, Archbishop, 569
 Sherburne, Ealstan, Bishop of, 42
 Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, his view of Napoleon's invasion of Spain, 772
 Sheriffs, office of, 164
 Ship-money, 484
 Shippen, his opinion of Walpole, 678
 Shire, Knights of, institution of, 164
 their union with the burgesses, 217
 Shrewsbury, foundation of, 38
 the Norman castle at, 76

- Shrewsbury, Earl of, intrigues with James the Second, 656
becomes Secretary of State, 659
- Sidney, Sir Philip, his character, 378
his relations with Spenser, 399
- Sidney, Sir Henry, his government of Ireland, 426
- Sidney, Algernon, his inclination to the Independents, 527
his trial and death, 624
- Sikhs, risings of, 788-789
- Simeon of Durham, as an authority, 75, 109
- Simon de Montfort, Earl of Leicester, 149 *n.*
marriage of, 149 *n.*
- "Six Acts," 798
- Skelton, his poetry, 376
- Slavery in Early England, 13
efforts of Church against, 53
trade in, abolished at Bristol, 53
prohibited by William I., 82
abolished by Act of Parliament, 786; *see* Wilberforce, Statutes
- Slaves, emancipation of, 805
- Sleswick, its relations with Early England, 1
- Smith, John, discovers Bay of Chesapeake, 473
- Smith, Adam, his "Wealth of Nations," 743
- Smith, Sir Sidney, defeats Buona-
parte at Acre, 759
- Smith, Dr. Southwood, and public
health, 813
- Snowdon, Lords of, 154
- Socinianism, its growth in Poland,
445
- Socinians excluded from the Parlia-
ment of 1657, 559
- Somers, Lord, chosen President of a
Royal Society, 578
a member of the Whig Junto,
659
becomes Lord Keeper, 659
effects the union between Eng-
land and Scotland, 673
President of the Council, 674
- Somerset, Duke of, in Henry the
Sixth's reign, 266
- Somerset the Protector, his acces-
sion to power, 337
his fall, 338
- Somerset, Earl of, his answer to
James the Second, 632
- Somersetshire, insurrection in,
against the Normans, 76
- Somerville, tries to murder Eliza-
beth, 393
- Sophia, Electress of Hanover, de-
clared successor to the throne,
664
- Soult, Marshal, 773, 774
- South African Union, 837
- South African War, 835
- Southampton, Earl of, his relations
with Shakspeare, 410
with the Earl of Essex, 411
- Southampton, Earl of, in James the
Second's time, becomes Lord
Treasurer, 584
- South Saxons; *see* Saxons, South
- South-Sea Bubble, 684
- Southumbrians, the, 15
- Southwark burnt by William I., 74
- Spa Fields meeting, 796
- Spain, its position in Europe in
Elizabeth's reign, 388, 389
relations between it and England
after the Armada, 414, 415
James the First's policy towards,
457, 458
war between it and England in
George the Second's time, 688
its treatment by Buonaparte, 772
invasion of, by Wellesley, 773; *see*
also Philip the Second
- Speed, his chronicles, 377
- Spenser, Elizabeth's favour to, 350,
353
his work and life, 399-402
his use of the Bible, 432
his influence on Milton, 493
- Stafford, Lord, his execution, 621
- Stair, Master of; *see* Glencoe,
Massacre of
- St. Albans, chronicle of, 278
- Stamp Act, the, 721-722
- Stanhope, Lord, First Lord of the
Treasury, cause of his death, 684
- Star-Chamber for Jews in William
the First's time, 80
- Charles the First's use of, 484
- Statutes, Petition of Commons, how
converted into them, 218
of Appeals, 318
Bill of Rights, 649
Board of Control, Indian; *see* Pitt
- Boston Port Act; *see* Boston
Conventicle Act, 590
- Five Mile Act, 590, 591
- Habeas Corpus Act, 625
- Heresies, 249-250, 339
- Kilkenny, 418
- Labourers, 234; *see* also Peasantry
- Libel Act, Fox's; *see* Fox, Charles
James
- Merchants, 161
- Monopolies, abolition of, 383
- Mortmain, 161
- Municipalities, Reform of, 787
- Mutiny Act, 650
- Poor Laws, 370, 371, 787
- Præmunire, 222
- Proclamations, Royal, 337
- Provisors, 222
- Quia Emptores, 161
- Reform Act, 786
- Regulation Act, Indian, 732
- Schism Act, 679
- Septennial Act, 682
- Six Articles Act, 336, 338
- Slave trade, abolition of, 771
- Slavery, abolition of, 787
- Stamp Act, 721
- Test Act, 386, 606, 651
- Toleration Act, 651

utes, Treasons Act, 758
 riennial Act, 651, 682
 Uniformity in Edward the
 Sixth's reign, 338
 Elizabeth's reign, 356
 Charles the Second's reign, 589
 Winchester, 160
 Bartholomew, Massacre of, 390
 1662; *see* Bartholomew, St.
 m., applied to industry, 810
 hen, King, his birth and educa-
 tion, 94
 onces Vacarius, 124
 nenson, George, 810
 Frideswide, the priory of, at
 Oxford, 124
 Hall, monastery of, 21
 George, Church of the canons of,
 at Oxford, 125
 and, Archbishop, 64
 his deposition, 79
 ngfleet, his schemes of Pro-
 testant comprehension, 601
 s pamphlets against super-
 stition, 631
 ing, battle of; *see* Battles
 ohn the lawyer, his comment on
 affairs in 1642, 499
 spatched to Holland by the
 Commonwealth, 540
 John, Henry; *see* Bolingbroke,
 Lord
 es, Peter, his attacks on the
 Lollards, 227
 c, his chronicles, 377
 Paul's, churchyard of, when
 built, 89
 aul's, meeting at, of Barons, 118
 ford; *see* Wentworth
 helyde annexed to kingdom of
 Scotland, 180 n.
 v, Jack, his position in Tyler's
 insurrection, 236
 kland, Elizabeth's order to, 381
 le, his view of the relations
 between Long Parliament and
 the Scotch, 503
 : attempted arrest, 509
 ng-bow; *see* Ireland, conquest of
 uth, General, 654
 rt, early line of, 360; *see* also
 Mary, James the First, etc.
 ury, Simon de, his murder
 approved by Hereford, 226
 vises the king to resist the insur-
 rections, 237
 death, 237
 Canal shares, 825
 lk, Earl of, in Henry the Sixth's
 reign, 264
 erland, Lord, truckles to Duke
 of York, 621
 catens to swamp House of
 Lords, 633
 policy, 659
 ents a "Cabinet," 657
 t to Vienna, 671
 missed, 676
 ah Dowlah, 709

Sussex, Earl of, his opinion of preva-
 lent state of religion in north, 369
 treatment of Shane O'Neill, 426
 Swegen, Danish leader, invades
 England, 56
 conquers England, 56
 Swegen, King of Denmark, his in-
 vasion of England, 76
 Swegen, son of Godwine, Earl of
 Mercia, 63
 Swift, Jonathan, his pamphlet
 against the Allies, 675
 Swithun, bishop of Winchester, 42
 TACITUS, his account of the Germans, 3
 Taft Vale judgment, 836
 Taillefer the minstrel, 73
 Talavera; *see* Battles
 Tallard, his assistance to the Allies,
 670
 Talleyrand, his desire for war be-
 tween France and Prussia, 781
 Tamar becomes the English frontier,
 40
 Taunton, origin of, 34
 Taylor, Cooke, and Ten Hours Act,
 813
 Taylor, Rowland, 344, 345
 Taylor, Jeremy, his "Liberty of
 Prophecyng," 580
 Temple, Sir William, makes the
 Triple Alliance, 602
 wishes to strengthen the Royal
 Council, 616
 his difference from Shaftesbury
 about Monmouth, 618
 his advice to Charles on the occa-
 sion, 618
 supports the Exclusion Bill, 618
 Temple, Lord, refusal of office, 722
 Tenchebray, battle of, 90
 Ten Hours Act, 813
 "Ten Hours" agitation, 805
 Test Act; *see* Statutes
 Tests, theological, at universities, 823
 Thanet assigned to England, 7, 8
 Thegn, origin of, 54
 Thelwall, trial of, 758
 Theobald of Canterbury, his holiness
 of life, 89
 a moral leader, 96
 Theodore of Tarsus dispatched to
 England, 28
 organization of the Church, 28, 29
 negotiates a peace, 34
 Thistlewood; *see* Cato Street Con-
 spiracy
 Thurstan, Archbishop of York,
 resists the Scots, 95
 Tillotson, Archbishop, his scheme of
 Protestant comprehension, 601
 writes pamphlets against super-
 stition, 631
 Tilsit, Peace of, 771
 "Times" quoted, 806
 Tippoo Sahib, his struggle with the
 English, 759
 Toleration Act; *see* Statutes
 Tooke, Horne; *see* Horne Tooke

"Tories," origin of the party, 620
 their change of policy on the accession of George the Third, 716
 support the younger Pitt, 740
 govern England after war with France, 773
 Tortulf the Forester, 91
 Tostig, son of Godwine, driven to Flanders, 64
 invades England with Harold Hardrada, 72
 defeated at Stamford Bridge; *see* Battles
 Tournaments introduced by Edward the First, 171
 occasions for vice under Edward the Third, 223
 Tourville, Admiral, 655, 656
 Town-Planning Act, 838
 Towns, causes of their early wealth and importance, 87
 their struggles for self-government, 87
 Townshend, his fall, 682
 Towton, battle of, 269
 Trade Boards Act, 838
 Trade Union Acts (1871, 1875), 824
 Trade unions, beginning of organization of, 807
 royal commission on, 819
 Transvaal War, 828
 self-government in, 837
 Treaty of Berlin (1878), 828
 of Berwick (1357), 203 *n.*
 of Newcastle (1334), 203 *n.*
 of Roxburgh (1332), 203 *n.*
 of Paris, 815
 of San Stefano (1878), 827
 Tresham; *see* Gunpowder Plot
 Triennial Act; *see* Statutes
 Triers, Cromwell's Board of, 553
 Troyes, Treaty of, 254
 Trumwine, Bishop of Whithorn, 32
 his flight, 32
 Trussel, Sir William, address to Edward II. on his deposition, 197
 Tunstall, Cuthbert, studies at Padua, 293
 Turgot, position as an annalist, 109
 motives and character of his policy, 741
 Turkey, alliance on behalf of, between England, Holland, and Prussia, 748
 saved from France by Convention of Cairo, 767
 revolt of Greeks against, 785
 Tyler, Wat, effect of his rising on Wyclif, 225
 details of his rising, 236
 Tyndale, his version of the Bible suppressed by Henry the Eighth, 316; *see also* Coverdale
 revives Lollardry, 330
 translates the Bible, 330-331
 effect of his work, 331, 431
 Tyrconnell, Lord, rule in Ireland, 640
 his struggle against William the Third, 648

"UITLANDERS," 835
 Ulster, colonization of, its effects, 552
 United States; *see* America, United States of
 Universities, rise of, 123; *see also* Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Cranmer
 attitude of, towards William after the Peasants' Revolt, 242
 Uriconium, the burning of, 13
 Usher, Archbishop, insulted by Strafford, 488
 scheme of Church government, 587
 Utrecht, peace of, 678
 the support of it by the Whigs, 683
 its gain to England, 684
 VACARIUS, his lectures at Oxford, 124
 Van Artevelde, effect of his death, 211
 Vane, Sir Henry, the elder, 519
 Vane, Sir Harry, the younger, lands in New England, 481
 leads the Independents, 508
 helps to form the league with Scotland, 515, 549
 his opposition to the Presbyterians, 527
 his reorganization of the navy, 539
 urges on the Reform Bill, 542, 544
 Cromwell's taunt to, 544
 offered a seat in the Council of State, 549
 opposes Richard Cromwell, 560
 defeat of his efforts in Richard Cromwell's Parliament, 561
 exempted from the indemnity, 587
 his trial and execution, 587
 Vere, Sir Horace, leader of volunteers, 458
 Vereeniging, peace of, 835
 Verney, Sir Edmund, his feelings to Charles the First, 507
 Vernon, Admiral, 690
 Vervins, treaty of, between France and Spain, 415
 Vespucci, Amerigo, his travels, 287
 Victoria, Queen, accession of, 787
 Villars, his battles, 669-674
 Villainage dies out after Tyler's rising, 242 *see also* Peasantry
 Villeneuve, Admiral, his struggle with Nelson, 769
 Virgil, study of his works revived in the thirteenth century, 123
 Virginia, discovery of, 473
 its aristocratic character, 713
 Washington's influence in, 728
 Voltaire, character and effect of his work, 747
 WACE, poem of, 111
 Walcheren, expedition to, 773
 Wales, reduction of, by William the First, 82
 share of, in the Barons' War, 149
 literature of; *see* Literature
 its relations to England, 151-153

- 3, conquest of, by Edward the First, 156; *see* Welsh
 ice, William, his career, 178-180
 r, Sir William, defeated by the Cornishmen, 514
 ngford, treaty of, 96
 ngton, John, his brother, 435
 s, Dr., 577
 ole, Sir Robert, his rise, 677
 foreign policy, 679
 dishke of reform, 681
 rns the House against the South Sea Bubble, 684
 foreign policy, 685
 Finance, 685
 fall, 689
 pends Convocation, 692
 drunkenness, 693
 ley in House of Lords, 698
 rejection of a plan of taxing America, 714
 apared with Pitt, 741
 ole, Horace, his admiration for Whitfield, 694
 account of Pitt's management of corruption, 703
 ount of Pitt's popularity, 703
 ount of victories in Canada, 712
 ngham, of St. Alban's, history of, 278
 ngham, in Elizabeth's reign, his opinion of Elizabeth, 353
 er de Map, his romances and atires, 111, 112
 orth, William, kills Tyler, 238
 Dr., a mathematician, 577
 ham, Dancs appear before, 44
 am, Archbishop, his life, 289
 dness to Erasmus, 289, 290
 attitude towards New Learning, 295
 sympathy with Erasmus's studies, 297
 view of Wolsey's taxes, 308
 omits Henry's claim to Con- vocation, 317
 s, 318
 view of the monks, 322
 enne, Earl of Surrey, as Regent of Scotland, 178, 179
 stance to Edward the First, .90
 ick, Earl of, in Edward the Second's time, his relations with Bayeston, 195
 ick, Earl of (King-maker), wins Battle of St. Alban's, 268
 position and career, 270-272
 ick, Dudley, Earl of; *see* Northumberland, Duke of
 ick, Rich., Earl of, in Charles the First's time, buys Connecticut, 481
 ned Admiral of the Fleet, 511
 ington, George, his influence in Virginia, 727
 plores the attack on the tea- ships, 728
 racter and position, 729, 730
 Watt, his steam-engine, 742
 its effects, 777
 Webster contrasted with Ben Jon- son, 413
 Wedmore, peace of, 44
 Wellesley, Lord, his devotion to Pitt, 741
 becomes Foreign Secretary, 773
 Wellington, Duke of, his successes in Portugal and Spain, 772-774, 779; *see* Battles
 character of his army at Waterloo, 782, 783
 refuses to serve under Canning, 785
 forms a Tory Ministry, 786
 accepts Catholic Emancipation, 786
 his ministry (1828-1830), 800
 Welsh, for early history, *see* Britons
 join Mercians against Northum- bria, 18
 oppressed by Normans, 76
 Wentworth, Peter, Elizabeth's treat- ment of, 383
 Wentworth, Thomas, his first elec- tion, 454
 made sheriff of a county, 464
 his declaration on the Petition of Right, 468
 his defence of that Petition, 486
 his early career, 486
 his devotion to the court, 486
 his "Thorough," 486
 his rule in Ireland, 488
 his suggestions as to methods of government in England, 495
 his opinion of Hampden, 497
 made Earl of Strafford, 498
 his return from Ireland, 499
 his attitude in the Scotch War, 500
 the hatred against him, 503
 his trial and execution, 503, 504
 Wesley, Charles, his hymns, 694
 Wesley, John, his early career, 695
 his differences from Whitfield, 696
 effect of their teaching in promot- ing abolition of slave-trade, 746
 Wessex, first colonization of, 14
 its reconversion, 23
 submits to Northumbria, 30
 rises again under Inl; *see* Inl
 its power broken by the Dancs, 41
 rises against them, 43
 reforms in; *see* Ælfred
 Westminster Confession, 525
 Westmoreland, Earl of, rises against Elizabeth, 369
 Weston, a favourite of Buckingham, 470
 administration as Treasurer, 483
 Westphalia, Peace of, its effects, 635
 Wexford, massacre of, 538
 Wharton, Lord, presents a petition for peace with Scotland, 500
 a member of Whig Junto, 659
 Whewell, Dr., his opinion of Roger Bacon, 132
 Whigs, their origin, 620
 their aims at the Revolution, 652

Whigs, their power, 659
 their war policy, 668
 their clause in the Act of Union with Scotland, 672-674
 impeachment of Sacheverell, 676
 their triumph under Walpole, 678
 submission to their leaders, 680
 their opposition to the younger Pitt's scheme of reform, 739
 defeated by Pitt, 740
 their opposition to Pitt's financial policy, 745
 their support of Fox at first in his approval of French Revolution, 750
 but subsequently leave him, 756;
see also Fox
 join Tories against Buonaparte, 768
 their later reforms, 786, 787
 Whitby, its monastery founded by Hild, 25
 Synod of, 27, 28
 the cowherd of; *see* Cædmon
 Whitelock, his views of the arrest of the five members, 500
 Whitfield, his preaching, 694
 Whitgift, his compulsion about the Articles, 441
 Whithorn, *see* of, 32
 Wiclif; *see* Wyclif
 Wiglaf, King of Mercia, 40
 Wilberforce, William, sympathy of Methodists with him, 697
 his account of Pitt's feeling when defeated in Parliament, 744
 brings in his Bill against the Slave Trade, 745
 his account of the cause of Pitt's death, 770
 Wilfrith of York, his life, 27
 his contest with Colman; *see* Colman
 Wilkes, John, denounced by the elder Pitt, 704
 prosecuted, 720
 expelled from House of Commons, and returned to it again, 724
 elected alderman of London, 724
 effect of his career, 726
 the abuses which made him advocate parliamentary reform, 744
 Wilkins, Dr., 578
 William of Malmesbury, 33, 75, 110
 William of Newborough, 97
 William of Jumlièges, 65, 68
 William Longsword, Duke of Normandy, 66
 William of Poitiers, his "Gesta Willelmi," 68
 William the Conqueror, his parentage and struggles with his subjects, 68, 69
 his character, 69, 70
 his struggle with the Angevins, 70
 his struggle with France, 70
 his rule in Normandy, 71
 he makes Lanfranc his minister, 71
 his visit to England, 71

William the Conqueror, wins battle of Senlac, 72-74
 his conquest of England, 74-77
 lays waste the north, 76
 introduces feudalism, 77
 his struggle with the Baronage, 78, 81
 his relations with the Church, 79
 his position as a landowner, 79
 character of his rule, 82
 abolishes capital punishment, 82
 his relations with Scotland and Wales, 82
 his death, 82
 William Rufus gains the crown, 82
 his rule, 83
 his military prowess, 84
 his death, 84
 William, son of Henry the First, his death, 90
 William, son of Robert, heir of Henry the First, 90
 William of Champeaux, his lectures, 125
 William the Lion, of Scotland, his relations with England, 175
 William Longbeard, 187
 William of Wykeham, 219
 William of Orange, the Silent, Elizabeth's relations with him, 355, 389, 390
 William of Orange, afterwards William III. of England leads the Dutch against Lewis XIV., 605
 Shaftesbury's intrigues with him, 610
 effect of his defeat, 612
 married to Mary, 612
 his education, 637
 his policy, 638
 his attitude towards James the Second, 639
 invited to England, 641
 his landing, 642
 becomes William the Third of England, 645
 his treatment of Scotland, 616
 effect of his accession on theory of Divine Right, 649
 his complaint of his treatment by Parliament, 649
 his conquest of Ireland, 654
 changes introduced into the form of government by his accession; *see* Sunderland, Cabinet
 his foreign policy, 659
 betrayed by Lewis, 660, 664
 his illness and death, 663-666
 William the Fourth, his accession, 786
 favours reform of Parliament, 786
 his death, 808
 Williams, Roger, expelled from Massachusetts, 481
 Williams, Bishop, his scheme of Church Reform, 508
 his protest, 508
 Willis, Dr., investigates the brain, 518

poses Wycherley, his dramas, 569
 1, 503 Wychif, his writings brought to
 Prague, 127
 his early life, obscurity of, 221
 his relation with Oxford and the
 schoolmen, 221
 his attack on the Papacy, 222
 his alliance with John of Gaunt,
 224-226
 effect on his work of Tyler's rising,
 226
 [294 attack on Transubstantiation, 226
 policy, his writings generally, 226
 his followers, 227
 his death, 228
 7, 308 Wynter, Admiral, his attack on
 king's Scotland, 361
 484 YORK, in the time of the Romans, 4
 capital of Roman Britain, 14
 York, Richard, Duke of, rebels
 against Henry VI., 266, 267
 convenes Parliament, 268
 his death, 268
 es York, James, Duke of, suspected by
 abert, the House of Commons, 605
 resigns his admiralship, 606
 returns in triumph after defeat of
 Exclusion Bill, 623; *see also*
 a by Exclusion Bill, Shaftesbury.
 Earl of, James the Second
 t, de- Young, Arthur, effect of his work
 on agriculture, 742

BIOGRAPHY

- Richard** (1615-91).
AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF RICHARD BAXTER. 868
James (1740-95). *See* Johnson.
Charlotte (1816-55).
1857. By *Mrs Gaskell*. Introduction by *May Sinclair*. (*See also* Fiction.) 318
Robert (1759-96).
1828. By *J. G. Lockhart* (1794-1854). With Introduction by *Prof. James*
Hey, M.A., PH.D. (*See also* Poetry and Drama.) 156
Lord (1788-1824).
1828. Edited by *R. G. Howarth, B.LITT.*, and with an Introduction by *André*
rois. (*See also* Poetry and Drama.) 931
William (1845-1926).
CHILD'S BOOK OF SAINTS, 1898. (*See also* Essays.) 61
Benvenuto (1500-71).
LIFE OF BENVENUTO CELLINI, written by himself. Translated by *Anne Mac-*
Il. Introduction by *William Gaunt.* 51
William (1731-1800).
LECTED LETTERS. Edited, with Introduction, by *W. Hadley, M.A.* 774
(See also Poetry and Drama.)
Charles (1812-70).
1874. By *John Forster* (1812-76). Introduction by *G. K. Chesterton.* 2 vols.
(See also Fiction.) 781-2
John (1620-1706).
1819. Edited by *William Bray*, 1819. Intro. by *G. W. E. Russell.* 2 vols. 220-1
1824-91.
1694. Revised by *Norman Penney*, with Account of Fox's last years.
duction by Rufus M. Jones. 754
Benjamin (1708-90).
BIOGRAPHY, 1817. With Introduction and Account of Franklin's later life by
Macdonald. Reset new edition (1949), with a newly compiled Index. 316
Johann Wolfgang von (1749-1832).
1855. By *G. H. Lewes* (1817-78). Introduction by *Harelock Ellis.* Index.
(See also Poetry and Drama.) 269
William Henry (1841-1922).
AWAY AND LONG AGO, 1918. Intro. by *John Galsworthy.* 956
Samuel (1709-84).
1781. Introduction by *Mrs L. Archer-Hind.* 2 vols.
(See also Essays, Fiction.) 770-1
WELL'S LIFE OF JOHNSON, 1791. A new edition (1949), with Introduction by
Roberts, M.A., LL.D., and a 30-page Index by Alan Dent. 2 vols. 1-2
ohn (1795-1821).
AND LETTERS, 1848. By *Lord Houghton* (1809-85). Introduction by *Robert*
Note on the letters by Lewis Gibbs. (*See also* Poetry and Drama.) 801
Charles (1775-1834).
1945 arranged from the Complete Annotated Edition of the
rs. 2 vols. (*See also* Essays and Belles-Lettres, Fiction.) 342-3
1 Buonaparte (1769-1821).
ORY OF NAPOLEON BUONAPARTE, 1829. By *J. G. Lockhart* (1794-1854). 3
(See also Essays and Belles-Lettres.)
Horatio, Viscount (1758-1805).
1813. By *Robert Southey* (1774-1843). (*See also* Essays.) 52
General Sir James (1803-63), 'the Bayard of India.'
1903. Deals with important passages in the history of India in the nineteenth
ry. By *L. J. Trotter* (1827-1912). 396
Samuel (1633-1703).
1953. Newly edited (1953), with modernized spelling, by *John Warrington*, from
dition of Mynors Bright (1875-9). 3 vols. 53-5
OF THE NOBLE GREEKS AND ROMANS. Dryden's edition, 1683-6. Revised,
Introduction, by A. H. Clough (1819-61). 3 vols. 407-9
1, Jean Jacques (1712-78).
SSIONS, 1782. 2 vols. Complete and unabridged English translation. New
duction by Prof. R. Niklaus, B.A., PH.D., of Exeter University. 859-60
(See also Essays, Theology and Philosophy.)
Walter (1771-1832).
HART'S LIFE OF SCOTT. An abridgement by *J. G. Lockhart* himself from the
al 7 volumes. New Introduction by *W. M. Parker, M.A.* 39

- Walpole, Horace (1717-87).
 SELECTED LETTERS. Edited, with Introduction, by W. Hadley, M.A. 775
 Wellington, Arthur Wellesley, Duke of (1769-1852).
 LIFE, 1862. By G. R. Gleig (1796-1888). 341

CLASSICAL

- Aeschylus (525-455 B.C.).
 PLAYS. Translated into English Verse by G. M. Cookson. New Introduction by John Warrington, and notes on each play. 62
 Aristophanes (450?-385? B.C.).
 THE COMEDIES. Translated by J. Hookham Frere, etc. Edited, with Introduction, by J. P. Maize and J. H. Frere. 2 vols. (Vol. I temporarily out of print.) 516
 Aristotle (384-322 B.C.).
 POLITICS AND THE ATHENIAN CONSTITUTION. Edited and translated by John Warrington. 605
 METAPHYSICS. Edited and translated by John Warrington. Introduction by Sir David Ross, K.B.E., M.A., D.LITT. 1000
 Caesar, Julius (102?-44 B.C.).
 WAR COMMENTARIES. 'The Gallic Wars' and 'The Civil War.' Newly translated and edited by John Warrington. 702
 Cicero, Marcus Tullius (106-43 B.C.).
 THE OFFICES (translated by Thomas Cockman, 1699); LAELIUS, ON FRIENDSHIP; CATO, ON OLD AGE; AND SELECT LETTERS (translated by W. Milmoth, 1753). With Note on Cicero's Character by De Quincey. Introduction by John Warrington. 345
 Demetrius (fl. late first century A.D.). (See under Aristotle.)
 Demosthenes (384-322 B.C.). (See under Oratory, p. 11.)
 Epictetus (b. c. A.D. 60).
 MORAL DISCOURSES. THE ENCHIRIDION AND FRAGMENTS. Translated by Elizabeth Carter (1717-1806). Edited by W. H. D. Rouse, M.A. 404
 Euripides (484?-407 B.C.).
 PLAYS. New Introduction by John Warrington. Translated by A. S. Way, D.LITT. 2 vols. 63, 271
 Herodotus (484?-425? B.C.).
 HISTORY. The 'History' deals with the period covering the Persian invasion of Greece, 492-480 B.C. Rawlinson's Translation, additional notes and Introduction, by E. H. Blakeney. 2 vols. (Vol. II temporarily out of print.) 405-6
 Homer (9th century B.C.).
 ILIAD. New verse translation by S. O. Andrew and Michael Oakley. 453
 ODYSSEY. The new verse translation (first published 1953) by S. O. Andrew. Introduction by John Warrington. 454
 Juvenal (c. A.D. 50-c. 130).
 SATIRES; WITH THE SATIRES OF PERSIUS. Introduction by Prof. H. J. Rose, M.A., F.B.A. William Gifford Translation, 1802. Revised by John Warrington. 997
 Lucretius (c. 99?-50? B.C.).
 ON THE NATURE OF THINGS. Metrical Translation by W. E. Leonard. 750
 Ovid (43 B.C.-A.D. 18).
 SELECTED WORKS. Chosen by J. C. and M. J. Thornton. Selections from the *Metamorphoses*, *Heroical Epistles*, the *Festivals*, the *Ibis*, and his epistles written in exile; also his *Art of Love*. 953
 Persius (34-62). See Juvenal.
 Plato (427-347 B.C.).
 THE REPUBLIC. Translated, with an Introduction, by A. D. Lindsay, C.B.E., LL.D. The greatest achievement of the Greek intellect in philosophy. 64
 SOCRATIC DISCOURSES OF PLATO AND XENOPHON. Introduction by A. D. Lindsay, C.B.E., LL.D. 457
 THE LAWS. The last of Plato's dialogues is here printed in the A. E. Taylor (1869-1945) Translation. 275
 Sophocles (496?-406 B.C.).
 DRAMAS. This volume contains the seven surviving dramas. 114
 Thucydides (c. 460-401 B.C.).
 HISTORY OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR. Translation by Richard Crawley. Introduction by John Warrington. Index and five plans. 455
 Virgil (70-19 B.C.).
 AENEID. Verse translation by Michael Oakley. Introduction by E. M. Forster. 161
 ECLOGUES AND GEORGICS. Verse Translation by T. F. Roys. The 'Eclogues' were inspired by Theocritus; the 'Georgics' describe a countryman's life. 222
 Xenophon (430?-360? B.C.). (See under Plato.)

- gy OF ENGLISH PROSE, FROM BEDE TO STEVENSON. 675
 Francis, Lord Verulam (1561-1626).
 ys, 1597-1626. Introduction by *Oliphant Smeaton*. Index of Quotations and
 ign Phrases and Glossary. (See also Theology and Philosophy.) 10
 , Walter (1826-77).
 RARY STUDIES, 1879. Introduction by *George Sampson*. 2 vols. 520-1
 Hilaire (1870-1953).
 IES, ESSAYS AND POEMS. Edited with Introduction by *J. B. Morton*, C.B.E.,
 volume now contains a new selection from the *Sonnets*, *Verses* and celebrated
rams. 948
 Edmund (1729-97).
 LECTIORS ON THE REVOLUTION IN FRANCE (1790) AND OTHER ESSAYS. Intro-
 ion and Notes by *A. J. Grievé*, M.A. (See also Oratory.) 460
 William (1845-1926).
 INVISIBLE PLAYMATE, 1894; *W. V.*, HER BOOK, 1896; and IN MEMORY OF
J., 1901. (See also Biography.) 566
 Thomas (1795-1881).
 ys. Introduction by *J. R. Lowell*. 2 vols. Essays on men and affairs. 703-4
 AND PRESENT, 1843. New Introduction by *Douglas Jerrold*. 608
 OR RESARTUS, 1838; and HEROES AND HERO-WORSHIP, 1841.
 (See also History.) 278
 ne, Baldassare (1478-1529).
 BOOK OF THE COURTIER, 1528. *Sir Thomas Hoby's* Translation, 1561. Intro-
 ion by *W. H. D. Rouse* and Notes by *Prof. W. B. Drayton Henderson*. 807
 A CENTURY OF ENGLISH ESSAYS, FROM CAXTON TO BELLOC. 653
 eld, Philip Dormer Stanhope, Earl of (1694-1773).
 ERS TO HIS SON; AND OTHERS. Introduction by *Prof. R. K. Root*. 823
 on, Gilbert Keith (1874-1936).
 IES, ESSAYS AND POEMS. Introduction by *Maise Ward*. An 'omnibus' volume
 ding four 'Father Brown' stories. 913
 s, Samuel Taylor (1772-1834).
 RAPHA LITERARIA, 1817. Edited with a new Introduction by *George Watson*.
 Coleridge described the work as 'sketches of my literary life and opinions.' 11
 ESPEAREAN CRITICISM, 1849. Edited with a long Introduction by *Prof.*
I. Haysor (1960), a distinguished Coleridge scholar of the University of
 aska. 2 vols. (See also Poetry and Drama.) 162, 183
 are, Walter (1873-1956).
 IES, ESSAYS AND POEMS. An anthology arranged by *Mildred Bozman*. 940
 ey, Thomas (1785-1859).
 ESSIONS OF AN ENGLISH OPIUM-EATER, 1822. Edited with Introduction by
J. E. Jordan (1960). 223
 inn, Johann Peter (1792-1854).
 ERSATIONS WITH GOETHE, 1836-8. Translated by *John Oxenford*, 1850.
 ed by *J. K. Moorhead*, with Introduction by *Harelock Ellis*. 851
 (See also Poetry and Drama, Biography.)
 t, Ralph Waldo (1803-82).
 ys, 1841-4. New Introduction by *Prof. Sherman Paul*. 12
 ohn (1553?-1625). (See Montaigne.)
 George (1813-78). 348
 LLERY OF LITERARY PORTRAITS, 1845-54.
 omas (1716-71).
 ys. (See Poetry.)
 n, Alexander (1757-1804), and Others.
 FEDERALIST, OR THE NEW CONSTITUTION, 1787-8. Introduction by *Prof. W. J.*
W. 519
 William (1778-1830).
 URES ON THE ENGLISH COMIC WRITERS, 1819; and MISCELLANEOUS ESSAYS.
 uction by *W. E. Henley*. 411
 URES ON THE ENGLISH POETS, 1818; and THE SPIRIT OF THE AGE, 1825.
 uction by *Catherine Macdonald Maclean*, M.A., D.LITT., F.R.S.L. 459
 ROUND TABLE AND CHARACTERS OF SHAKESPEAR'S PLAYS, 1817-18. New
 uction by *Catherine Macdonald Maclean*. 65
 E TALK, 1821-2, 1824. New Introduction by *Catherine Macdonald Maclean*. 321
 Oliver Wendell (1809-94).
 AUTOCRAT OF THE BREAKFAST-TABLE, 1858. Introduction by *Van Wyck*
ts. 66
 igh (1784-1859).
 CTED ESSAYS. 78 essays with Introduction by *J. B. Priestley*. 829
 Aldous Leonard (b. 1894).
 IES, ESSAYS AND POEMS. 935
 , Samuel (1709-84).
 RAMBLER. Introduction by *S. C. Roberts*. (See also Biography, Fiction.) 994

- Birrell*. Includes the first and the last Essays or *Essays*. (See also Biography, Fiction.)
- Landor, Walter Savage** (1775-1864).
IMAGINARY CONVERSATIONS, AND POEMS, 1824-9, 1853. Edited, with Introduction, by *Havelock Ellis*. 890
- Lawrence, David Herbert** (1885-1930).
STORIES, ESSAYS AND POEMS. Selected by *Desmond Hawkins*. Poetry, Essays, Travel Sketches and Letters. 958
(See also Fiction.)
- Locke, John** (1632-1704).
AN ESSAY CONCERNING HUMAN UNDERSTANDING, 1690. Abridged and edited by *Raymond Wilburn*, presenting the whole sweep of the work. 984
(See also Theology and Philosophy.)
- Lynd, Robert** (1879-1949).
ESSAYS ON LIFE AND LITERATURE. Introduction by *Desmond MacCarthy*. 990
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, Lord** (1800-59).
CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL ESSAYS, 1843. New Introduction by *Douglas Jerrold*. 2 vols. 225-6
MISCELLANEOUS ESSAYS, 1823-59; LAYS OF ANCIENT ROME, 1842; and MISCELLANEOUS POEMS, 1812-47. Introduction by *Prof. G. M. Trevelyan, O.M.* 439
(See also History.)
- Machiavelli, Niccolò** (1469-1527).
THE PRINCE, 1513. New Introduction by *Prof. H. Butterfield, M.A., HON. D.LITT.*
Translated by *W. K. Marriott*. 280
- Mazzini, Joseph** (1805-72).
THE DUTIES OF MAN (translated by *Miss E. Noyes*); and OTHER ESSAYS. New Introduction by *Dr Thomas Jones, O.H., LL.D.* 224
- Milton, John** (1608-74).
PROSE WRITINGS. Introduction by *K. M. Burton, M.A.* The contents of this volume include 'Arcopagitica,' 1644, and other important prose works. 795
(See also Poetry, etc.)
- Mitford, Mary Russell** (1787-1855).
OUR VILLAGE, 1824-32. Edited, with an Introduction, by *Sir John Squire*. 927
- Modern Humour**. An Anthology in Prose and Verse from over sixty authors. 957
- Montaigne, Michel de** (1533-92).
ESSAYS, 1580-8. John Florio's version, 1603. Edited (from the third edition, 1632), with Intro. by *A. R. Waller*, 3 vols. (Vol. I temporarily out of print.) 440-2
- Napoleon Buonaparte** (1769-1821).
LETTERS. Some 300 of the most interesting of the Emperor's letters, chosen and translated by *J. M. Thompson, F.B.A., F.R.HIST.S.* (See also Biography.) 995
- Nelson, Horatio, Viscount** (1758-1805).
NELSON'S LETTERS. Compiled by *Geoffrey Rawson*. (See also Biography.) 244
- Newman, John Henry** (1801-90).
ON THE SCOPE AND NATURE OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION; and CHRISTIANITY AND SCIENTIFIC INVESTIGATION, 1852. Introduction by *Wilfrid Ward*. 723
(See also Theology and Philosophy.)
- Poe, Edgar Allan** (1809-49).
ESSAYS. (See Poetry.)
- Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur** (1863-1944).
CAMBRIDGE LECTURES, from 'Q.'s' well-known books *The Art of Reading*, 1920; *The Art of Writing*, 1916; *Studies in Literature*, 1918; and *Shakespeare's Workmanship*, 1918. (See also Fiction.) 974
- Rousseau, Jean Jacques** (1712-78).
ÉMILE; OR, EDUCATION. Translated by *Barbara Foxley, M.A.* Intro. (1955) by *Prof. André Boulet de Monvel*. (See also Biography, Theology and Philosophy.) 518
- Ruskin, John** (1819-1900).
SESAME, AND LILIES, 1864; THE TWO PATHS, 1859; and THE KING OF THE GOLDEN RIVER; OR THE BLACK BROTHERS, 1851. Introduction by *Sir Oliver Lodge*. 219
THE SEVEN LAMPS OF ARCHITECTURE, 1849. With an Introduction (1958) by *Sir Arnold Lunn*. Illustrated with 14 plates of engravings. 207
- Sévigne, Marie de Rabutin-Chantal, Marquise de** (1626-96).
SELECTED LETTERS. Selected and translated by *H. T. Barnwell, M.A.* 98
- Spectator, The**, 1711-14. By *Joseph Addison* (1672-1719), *Sir Richard Steele* (1672-1729) and Others. Edited by *Prof. Gregory Smith*. New Introduction by *P. Smithers, D.PHIL., M.P.*, and a Biographical and General Index by *Prof. Gregory Smith*. Reset with minor revisions, 1945. 4 vols. (See also Essays under Steele.) 164-7
- Spencer, Herbert** (1820-1903).
ESSAYS ON EDUCATION, 1861. Introduction by *C. W. Eliot*. 504
- Steele, Sir Richard** (1672-1729).
THE TATLER, 1709-11. 993
- Sterne, Laurence** (1713-68).
A SENTIMENTAL JOURNEY THROUGH FRANCE AND ITALY, 1768; JOURNAL TO ELIZA, written in 1767; and LETTERS TO ELIZA, 1766-7. Introduction by *Daniel George*. (See also Fiction.) 786

CHAMBERLAIN (1601-1745).	
SALE OF A TUB, 1704; THE BATTLE OF THE BOOKS, 1704; and OTHER SATIRES. Introduction by <i>Louis Melville</i> . (See also Biography, Fiction.)	347
TON, Frank (b. 1884).	
GEORGIAN LITERARY SCENE, 1935. A panorama, revised 1951, of English writers (novelists, essayists, dramatists, poets) from 1919.	943
AY, William Makepeace (1811-63).	
ENGLISH HUMORISTS, 1851; CHARITY AND HUMOUR, 1853; and THE FOUR RAGES, 1855. Introduction by <i>Walter Jerrold</i> . (See also Fiction.)	610
Y, Henry David (1817-62).	
ADEN, OR LIFE IN THE WOODS, 1854. Introduction by <i>Prof. Basil Willey</i> .	281
Richard Chevenix (1807-86).	
THE STUDY OF WORDS, 1851; and ENGLISH PAST AND PRESENT, 1855. Introduction by <i>George Sampson</i> .	788
Alexander Fraser (1747-1814).	
AY ON THE PRINCIPLES OF TRANSLATION, 1791.	168
Izaak (1593-1683).	
COMPLETE ANGLER, 1653. Introduction by <i>Andrew Lang</i> .	70

FICTION

th, William Harrison (1805-82).	
SAINT PAUL'S, 1841. Introduction by <i>W. E. Axon</i> LL.D. Great Fire of London.	622
KWOOD, 1834. Introduction by <i>Frank Swinnerton</i> . Dick Turpin.	870
TOWER OF LONDON, 1840. Lady Jane Grey.	400
DSOR CASTLE, 1843. Intro. by <i>Ernest Rhys</i> . Henry VIII and Ann Boleyn.	709
in <i>Short Stories of the Nineteenth Century</i> . Edited, with an Introduction, by <i>Cournois</i> . Twenty stories from representative writers.	840
n, Hans Christian (1805-75).	
TY TALES AND STORIES. This represents a completely new selection and in the invalid Spink Translation.	4
Jane (1775-1817). Each volume has an Introduction by <i>R. Brimley Johnson</i> .	
IA, 1816.	24
PRIDE AND PREJUDICE, 1823.	22
SFIELD PARK, 1814.	23
SENSE AND SENSIBILITY, 1811.	21
THANGER ABBEY, 1818; and PERSUASION, 1818.	25
Honoré de (1799-1850).	
THE SIGN OF THE CAT AND RACKET, 1830; and OTHER STORIES. Translated by <i>a Bell</i> . Introduction by <i>George Saintsbury</i> .	349
ENIE GRANDDET, 1834. Translated by <i>Ellen Marriage</i> . New Introduction by <i>Marcel Girard</i> .	169
GORIOT, 1835. Translated by <i>Ellen Marriage</i> . New Introduction by <i>Prof. Marcel Girard</i> .	170
WILD ASS'S SKIN, 1831. A youth makes a bargain with destiny. New Introduction by <i>Prof. Marcel Girard</i> .	26
de, Henri (1874-1935).	
ER FIRE, THE STORY OF A SQUAD, 1916. Introduction by <i>Brian Rhys</i> .	798
field, Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of (1804-81).	
INGSBY, 1844. Introduction and Notes (with a Key to the Characters) by <i>B. N. Jodon-Davies</i> .	535
, Arnold (1867-1931).	
OLD WIVES' TALE, 1908. The most durable novel of Bennett's.	919
ore, Richard Doddridge (1825-1900).	
NA DOONE: A ROMANCE OF EXMOOR, 1869. Introduction by <i>Ernest Rhys</i> .	304
, George (1803-81).	
ROMANY RYE, 1857. Practically a sequel to <i>Lavengro</i> . (See also Travel.)	120
Anne (1820-49).	
TENANT OF WILDFELL HALL and AGNES GREY. With a new Introduction by <i>Margaret Lane</i> .	685
Charlotte (1816-55). For Mrs Gaskell's 'Life' see Biography.	
E EYRE, 1847. Introduction by <i>Margaret Lane</i> .	287
PROFESSOR, 1857. Introduction by <i>Margaret Lane</i> .	417
LEY, 1849. Introduction by <i>Margaret Lane</i> .	288
ETTE, 1853. Introduction by <i>Margaret Lane</i> .	351
Emily (1818-48).	
SHERING HEIGHTS, 1848; and POEMS. Introduction by <i>Margaret Lane</i> .	243
Fanny (Madame Frances d'Arblay, 1753-1849).	
LINA, 1778. Introduction by <i>Lewis Gibbs</i> .	352
Samuel (1835-1902).	
WHON, 1872 (revised 1901); and EREWHON REVISITED, 1901. Introduction by <i>nod MacCarthy</i> .	881
WAY OF ALL FLESH, 1903. Introduction by <i>A. J. Hoppé</i> .	895

- Conrad, Joseph** (1857-1924).
LORD JIM, 1900. Characteristically set in the East Indies. Introduction by *R. B. Cunningham Graham*. 925
THE NIGGER OF THE 'NARCISSUS,' 1897; **TYPHOON**, 1903; and **THE SHADOW LINE**, 1917. Introduction by *A. J. Hoppé*. Three of Conrad's best-known stories. 980
NOSTROMO, 1904. New edition of Conrad's greatest novel with an Introduction by *Richard Curle*. 38
- Cooper, James Fenimore** (1789-1851).
THE LAST OF THE MOHICANS, 1826, **A NARRATIVE OF 1757**. With an Introduction by *Ernest Rhys*. 79
THE PRAIRIE, 1827. The last of the 'Leatherstocking Tales.' 172
- Craik, Mrs.** See *Mulock*.
- Daudet, Alphonse** (1840-97).
TARTARIN OF TARASCON, 1872; and **TARTARIN ON THE ALPS**, 1885. Two light episodic novels, some of the funniest episodes ever written in French. 423
- Defoe, Daniel** (1661?-1731).
THE FORTUNES AND MISFORTUNES OF MOLL FLANDERS, 1722. Introduction by *G. A. Aitken*. One of Defoe's greatest books, famous for its picture of low life. 837
JOURNAL OF THE PLAGUE YEAR, 1722. Introduction by *G. A. Aitken*. 289
LIFE, ADVENTURES AND PIRACIES OF THE FAMOUS CAPTAIN SINGLETON, 1720. Introduction by *Edward Garnett*. A supposed record of a journey across Africa. 74
ROBINSON CRUSOE, 1719. Parts 1 and 2 complete. Introduction by *Guy N. Pocock*. (See also *Travel*.) 59
- De Rojas, Fernando** (15th century).
CELESTINA: OR THE TRAGI-COMEDY OF CALISTO AND MELIBEA, attributed to Fernando de Rojas. Translated, with an Introduction, by *Phyllis Hartnoll, M.A., L. ES L.* This is a new translation (1958). 100
- Dickens, Charles** (1812-70). Each of the following volumes of Dickens's works has an Introduction by *G. K. Chesterton*:
BARNABY RUDGE, 1841. 76 **LITTLE DORRIT**, 1857. 293
BLF AK HOUSE, 1852-3. 236 **MARTIN CHUZZLEWIT**, 1843-4. 241
CHRISTMAS BOOKS, 1843-8. 239 **NICHOLAS NICKLEBY**, 1838-9. 238
CHRISTMAS STORIES, 1850-67. 414 **OLD CURIOSITY SHOP**, 1841. 173
DAVID COPPERFIELD, 1849-50. 242 **OLIVER TWIST**, 1838. 233
DOMBEY AND SON, 1846-8. 240 **OUR MUTUAL FRIEND**, 1864-5. 294
GREAT EXPECTATIONS, 1851. 234 **PICKWICK PAPERS**, 1836-7. 235
HARD TIMES, 1854. 292 **A TALE OF TWO CITIES**, 1859. 102
(See also *Biography*.)
- Disraeli, Benjamin.** See *Beaconsfield*.
- Dostoyevsky, Fyodor** (1821-81).
THE BROTHERS KARAMAZOV, 1879-80. Translated by *Constance Garnett*. Introduction by *Edward Garnett*. 2 vols. 802-3
CRIME AND PUNISHMENT, 1866. *Constance Garnett* translation. 501
THE IDIOT, 1873. Translated by *Eva M. Martin*. New Introduction by *Richard Curle*. 682
LETTERS FROM THE UNDERWORLD, 1864; and **OTHER TALES (THE GENTLE MAIDEN; THE LANDLADY)**. Translated, with Introduction, by *C. J. Hogarth*. 654
POOR FOLK, 1845; and **THE GAMBLER**, 1867. Translated, with Introduction, by *C. J. Hogarth*. 711
THE POSSESSED, 1871. Translated by *Constance Garnett*. Introduction by *Nikolay Andreyev, PH.D., M.A.* 2 vols. 861-2
- Dumas, Alexandre** (1802-70).
THE BLACK TULIP, 1850. The brothers De Witt in Holland, 1672-5. New Introduction by *Prof. Marcel Girard*. 174
COUNT OF MONTE CRISTO, 1844. 2 vols. Napoleon's later phase. New Introduction by *Prof. Marcel Girard*. 393-4
MARGUERITE DE VALOIS, 1845. The Eve of St Bartholomew. 326
THE THREE MUSKETEERS, 1844. The France of Cardinal Richelieu. 81
- Du Maurier, George Louis Palmella Busson** (1834-96).
TRILBY, 1894. Illustrated by the author. Preface by *Sir Gerald Du Maurier*. *Trilby* breathes the air of Paris in the eighties and is drawn largely from the author's own experience. 863
- Edgeworth, Maria** (1767-1849).
CASTLE RACKRENT, 1800; and **THE ABSENTEE**, 1812. Introduction by *Prof. Brander Matthews*. 410
- Elliot, George** (pseudonym of Mary Ann Evans, 1819-80).
ADAM BEDE, 1859. New Introduction by *Robert Speaight*. 27
MIDDLEMARCH, 1872. New Introduction by *Gerald Bullett*. 2 vols. 854-5
THE MILL ON THE FLOSS, 1860. Introduction by *Sir W. Robertson Nicoll*. 325
ROMOLA, 1863. Intro. by *Rudolph Dircks*. The Florence of Savonarola. 231
SILAS MARNER, THE WEAVER OF RAVELOE, 1861. Introduction by *A. Matheson*. 12

- Henry (1701-54). *George Barnsbury* has written an introduction to the lively Fielding. 852-3
- LIA, 1751. 2 vols. Amelia is drawn from Fielding's first wife. 852-3
- THAN WILD, 1743; and JOURNAL OF A VOYAGE TO LISBON, 1755. *Jonathan* is a satire on false hero-worship; the *Journal* (published posthumously) states the incidents of Fielding's last voyage. 877
- PH ANDREWS, 1742. A skit on Richardson's *Pamela*. 467
- JONES, 1749. 2 vols. The first great English novel of humour. 355-6
- , Gustave (1821-80).
- AME BOVARY, 1857. Translated by *Eleanor Marx-Aveling*. Introduction by *Je Saintsbury*. 808
- MMBO, 1862. Translated by *J. C. Chartres*. Introduction by *Prof. F. C. Green*. 869
- PH.D. The war of the Mercenaries against Carthage. 869
- MENTAL EDUCATION, 1869. Modern translation, with Introduction and Notes *Anthony Goldsmith*. 969
- Edward Morgan (b. 1879).
- SSAGE TO INDIA, 1924. With an Introduction by *Peter Burra*. 972
- thy, John (1867-1933). 917
- COUNTRY HOUSE.
- Mrs Elizabeth (1810-65).
- OFORD, 1853. Introduction by *Frank Swinnerton*. (See also Biography.) 83
- ories. Introduction by *John Hampden*. Eighteen stories. 952
- Nikolay (1809-52).
- D SOULS, 1842. Introduction by *Nikolay Andreyev*, PH.D., M.A. 726
- th, Oliver (1728-74). 295
- VICAR OF WAKEFIELD, 1766. Introduction by *J. M. Dent*. (See also Poetry.) 295
- ov, Ivan (1812-91).
- MOV, 1857. First complete English translation by *Natalie Duddington*. New introduction by *Nikolay Andreyev*, PH.D., M.A. 878
- Maxim (pseudonym of Alexei Maximovitch Pieshkov, 1868-1936).
- OUGH RUSSIA. Translated, with an Introduction, by *C. J. Hogarth*. 741
- th, George (1847-1912), and Weedon (1853-1919).
- DIARY OF A NOBODY, 1894. With Weedon Grossmith's illustrations. 963
- ne, Nathaniel (1804-64).
- HOUSE OF THE SEVEN GABLES, 1851. New Introduction by *Prof. Roy Harvey*. 176
- ce.
- SCARLET LETTER: A ROMANCE, 1850. With new Introduction by *Prof. Roy Harvey Pearce*. 122
- E-TOLD TALES, 1837-42. With a new Introduction by *Prof. Roy Harvey*. 531
- ce.
- ictor Marie (1802-85).
- MISÉRABLES, 1862. Introduction by *Denis Saurat*. 2 vols. 363-4
- RE DAME DE PARIS, 1831. Introduction by *Denis Saurat*. 422
- ERS OF THE SEA, 1866. Introduction by *Ernest Rhys*. 509
- Aldous.
- IES, ESSAYS AND POEMS. (See under Essays.)
- Henry (1843-1916).
- AMBASSADORS, 1903. Introduction by *Frank Swinnerton*. 987
- TURN OF THE SCREW, 1898; and THE ASPERN PAPERS, 1888. Two famous short ls. Introduction by *Prof. Kenneth B. Murdock*, A.M., PH.D. 912
- , Richard (1848-87).
- ER LONDON, 1884; and AMARYLLIS AT THE FAIR, 1886. Introduction by *ard Garnett*. 951
- Jerome K. (1859-1927).
- EE MEN IN A BOAT and THREE MEN ON THE BUMMEL. Introduction by *D. C. ming*, M.A., B.LITT. 118
- , Charles (1819-75).
- EWARD THE WAKE, 1866. Introduction by *Ernest Rhys*. 296
- TWARD HO!, 1855. Introduction by *Dr J. A. Williamson*, M.A. 20
- Charles (1775-1834), and Mary (1764-1847).
- ES FROM SHAKESPEARE, 1807. Illustrated by *Arthur Rackham*. 8
- ie, David Herbert (1885-1930). (See also Biography, Essays.)
- WHITE PEACOCK, 1911. (See also Essays.) 914
- erre (1850-1923).
- AND FISHERMAN, 1886. Translated by *W. P. Baines*. 920
- amuel (1797-1868).
- DY ANDY, 1842. Lover was a musician, portrait-painter, song-writer and actor also wrote four novels of which this is generally accounted the best. 178
- Edward Bulwer, Baron (1803-73).
- LAST DAYS OF POMPEII, 1834. A romance of the first century A.D. 80
- Thomas (1875-1955).
- IES AND EPISODES. Introduction by *Prof. Erich Heller*, PH.D. 962

- EDITED BY *Elizabeth Colclough*, 1920. 2 vols. 8s.
- Marryat, Frederick** (1792-1848).
 MR MIDSHIPMAN EASY. New Introduction by *Oliver Warner*. 82
 THE SETTLERS IN CANADA, 1844. Introduction by *Oliver Warner*. 370
- Maugham, W. Somerset** (b. 1874).
 CAKES AND ALE, 1930. The finest novel of the author's inter-war period. 932
- Maupassant, Guy de** (1850-93).
 SHORT STORIES. Translated by *Marjorie Laurie*. Intro. by *Gerald Gould*. 907
- Melville, Herman** (1819-91).
 MOBY DICK, 1851. Intro. by *Prof. Sherman Paul*. 179
 TYPEE, 1846; and HILLY BUDD (published 1924). South Seas adventures. New
 Introduction by *Milton R. Stern*. 180
- Meredith, George** (1828-1909).
 THE ORDEAL OF RICHARD FEVEREL, 1859. Introduction by *Robert Sencourt*. 916
- Mickiewicz, Adam** (1798-1855).
 PAN TADEUSZ, 1834. Translated into English prose, with Introduction, by *Prof.*
G. R. Noyes. Poland's epic of Napoleonic wars. 842
- Modern Short Stories**. Selected by *John Hadfield*. Twenty stories. 954
- Moore, George** (1852-1933).
 ESTHER WATERS, 1894. The story of Esther Waters, the servant girl who 'went
 wrong.' Introduction by *C. D. Medley*. 933
- Mulock [Mrs Craik], Maria** (1826-87).
 JOHN HALIFAX, GENTLEMAN, 1856. Introduction by *J. Shaylor*. 123
- Pater, Walter** (1839-94).
 MARIUS THE EPICUREAN, 1885. Introduction by *Osbert Burdett*. 903
- Poe, Edgar Allan** (1809-49).
 TALES OF MYSTERY AND IMAGINATION. Introduction by *Padraic Colum*. 336
 (See also Poetry and Drama.)
- Priestley, J. B.** (b. 1894).
 ANGEL PAVEMENT, 1931. A finely conceived novel of London. 938
- Quiller-Couch, Sir Arthur** (1863-1944).
 BETTY WESLEY, 1903. Introduction by the author. (See also Essays.) 864
- Radcliffe, Mrs Ann** (1764-1823).
 THE MYSTERIES OF UDOLPHO, 1794. Intro. by *R. A. Freeman*. 2 vols. 865-6
- Reade, Charles** (1814-84).
 THE CLOISTER AND THE HEARTH, 1861. Introduction by *Swinnburne*. 29
- Richardson, Samuel** (1689-1761).
 PAMELA, 1740. Introduction by *George Saintsbury*. 2 vols. 683-4
 CLARISSA, 1747-8. Introduction by *Prof. W. L. Phelps*. 4 vols. 882-5
- Russian Short Stories**. Translated, with Introduction, by *Rochelle S. Townsend*. Stories
 by Pushkin, Gogol, Tolstoy, Korolenko, Chehov, Chirukov, Andreyev, Kuprin,
 Gorky, Sologub. 758
- Scott, Sir Walter** (1771-1832).
 The following Waverley Novels each contain an Introduction, biographical and
 bibliographical, based upon Lockhart's *Life*
 THE ANTIQUARY, 1816. Introduction by *W. M. Parker, M.A.* 126
 THE BRIDE OF LAMMERMOOR, 1819. A romance of life in East Lothian, 1695. New
 Introduction by *W. M. Parker, M.A.* 129
 GUY MANNERING, 1815. A mystery story of the time of George III. New Intro-
 duction by *W. M. Parker, M.A.* 133
 THE HEART OF MIDLOTHIAN, 1818. Period of the Porteous Riots, 1736. New Intro-
 duction by *W. M. Parker, M.A.* 134
 IVANHOE, 1820. A romance of the days of Richard I. 16
 KENILWORTH, 1821. The tragic story of Amy Robsart, in Elizabeth I's time. New
 Preface and Glossary by *W. M. Parker, M.A.* 135
 OLD MORTALITY, 1817. Battle of Bothwell Bridge, 1679. New Introduction by
W. M. Parker, M.A. 137
 QUENTIN DURWARD, 1823. A tale of adventures in fifteenth-century France. New
 Introduction by *W. M. Parker, M.A.* 140
 REDGAUNTLET, 1824. A tale of adventure in Cumberland, about 1763. New Intro-
 duction by *W. M. Parker, M.A.* 141
 ROB ROY, 1818. A romance of the Rebellion of 1715. 142
 THE TALISMAN, 1825. Richard Cœur-de-Lion and the Third Crusade, 1191. New
 Preface by *W. M. Parker, M.A.* (See also Biography.) 144
- Shchedrin (M. E. Saltikov, 1826-92).**
 THE GOLOVLYOV FAMILY. Translated by *Natalie Duddington*. Introduction by
Edward Garnett. 908
- Shelley, Mary Wollstonecraft** (1797-1851).
 FRANKENSTEIN, 1818. With Mary Shelley's own Preface. 616
- Shorter Novels.**
 Vol. I: ELIZABETHAN. Introduction by *George Saintsbury* and Notes by *Philip*
Henderson. Contains: DeLoney's 'Jack of Newberio' and 'Thomas of Reading';
 Nashe's 'The Unfortunate Traveller'; Green's 'Cardo of Fancie.' 824

- He's 'The Isle of Pines'; Congreve's 'Incognita.' 841
- III: EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. Edited, with Introduction, by *Philip Henderson*.
ains: Beckford's 'Vathek'; Horace Walpole's 'The Castle of Otranto'; Dr
son's 'Rasselas.' 858
- icz, Henryk (1846-1916).
- VADIS? 1896. Translated by *C. J. Hogarth*. Intro. by *Monica Gardner*. 970
- s. Edited, with Introduction, by *Monica Gardner*. 871
- Tobias (1721-71).
- EXPEDITION OF HUMPHRY CLINKER, 1771. Introduction by *Howard Mumford*
i, and 36 pages of Notes by *Charles Lee*. 975
- GRINE PICKLE, 1751. Introduction by *Waller Allen*. 2 vols. 838-9
- ERICK RANDOM, 1742. Introduction by *H. W. Hodges*. 790
- le, E. CE. (1858-1949), and Ross, Martin (pseudonym of Violet Florence
in, 1862-1915).
- IRIENCES OF AN IRISH R.M. Contains the authors' two books, *Some Experiences*
Irish R.M., 1897, and *Further Experiences of an Irish R.M.*, 1908. 978
- (pseudonym of Henri Beyle, 1783-1842).
- LET AND BLACK, 1831. Translated by *C. K. Scott Moncrieff*. Introduction by
F. C. Green, M.A., DR.PHIL. 2 vols. 945-6
- laurence (1713-68).
- RAM SHANDY, 1760-7. Intro. by *George Saintsbury*. (See also Essays.) 617
- n, Robert Louis (1850-94).
- EKYL AND MR HYDE, 1886; THE MERRY MEN, 1887; WILL O' THE MILL,
MARKHEIM, 1886; THRAWN JANET, 1881; OLALLA, 1885; THE TREASURE
RANCHARD. Introduction by *M. R. Ridley*. 767
- MASTER OF BALLANTRAE, 1869; WEIR OF HERMISTON, 1896. New Introduction
by *M. R. Ridley*. 764
- ES, 1898. Completed by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch. Introduction (1958) by
M. Ridley. 904
- SURE ISLAND, 1883; and KIDNAPPED, 1886. Introduction by *Sir Arthur*
Quiller-Couch. (See also Essays, Poetry, Travel.) 763
- ok for Boys and Girls. Edited by *Guy Pocock* (1955). 934
- Robert Smith (1803-64).
- OCKS'S JAUNTS AND JOLLITIES, 1838. 817
- nathan (1667-1745).
- YVER'S TRAVELS, 1726. An unabridged edition; with an Introduction by *Sir*
d Williams, F.B.A., F.S.A., M.A. (See also Biography, Essays.) 60
- Detection. Introduction by *Dorothy L. Sayers*. Nineteen stories, tracing the
opment of the genuine detective story during the last hundred years. 928
- y, William Makepeace (1811-63).
- Y ESMOND, 1852. Introduction by *Walter Jerrold*. 73
- NEWCOMES, 1853-5. 2 vols. Introduction by *Walter Jerrold*. 465-6
- ENNIS, 1848-50. 2 vols. Introduction by *M. R. Ridley*, M.A. 425-6
- RY FAIR, 1847-8. Introduction by *Hon. Whitelaw Reid*. 298
- VIRGINIANS, 1857-9. 2 vols. Introduction by *Walter Jerrold*. 507-8
- (See also Essays and Belles-Lettres.)
- Count Leo (1828-1910).
- KARENINA, 1873-7. Translated by *Rochelle S. Townsend*. With Introduction
ikolay Andreyev, PH.D., M.A. 2 vols. 812-13
- ER AND MAN, 1895; and OTHER PARABLES AND TALES. Introduction (1958)
ikolay Andreyev, PH.D., M.A. 469
- AND PEACE, 1864-9. Introduction by *Vicomte de Vogüé*. 3 vols. 525-7
- Anthony (1815-82).
- WARDEN, 1855. The first of the 'Chronicles of Barset.' Introduction by
leen Tillotson, M.A., B.LITT. 182
- HESTER TOWERS, 1857. The second of the 'Chronicles of Barset.' Introduction
on Anthony Trollope's 'Clergy' by *Michael Sadleir*. 30
- OR THORNE, 1858. The third of the 'Chronicles of Barset.' 360
- LEY PARSONAGE, 1861. The fourth of the 'Chronicles of Barset.' Introduction
athleen Tillotson. 181
- MALL HOUSE AT ALLINGTON, 1864. The fifth of the 'Chronicles of Barset.' 361
- LAST CHRONICLE OF BARSET, 1867. 2 vols. 391-2
- , Ivan (1818-83).
- ERS AND SONS, 1862. Translated by *Dr Avril Pyman*. 742
- E, 1867. A new translation, with Introduction, by *Natalie Duddington*. 988
- N SOIL, 1877. Translated by *Rochelle S. Townsend*. 528
- ark (pseudonym of Samuel Langhorne Clemens, 1835-1910).
- AWYER, 1876; and HUCKLEBERRY FINN, 1884. Introduction by *Christopher*
W. 976
- les (1828-1905).
- WEEKS IN A BALLOON, 1862, translated by *Arthur Chambers*; and AROUND
WORLD IN EIGHTY DAYS, translated by *P. Desages*. 779
- TY THOUSAND LEAGUES UNDER THE SEA, 1869. 319

Walpole, Hugh Seymour (1884-1941).	
MR PERRIN AND MR TRAILL, 1911.	918
Wells, Herbert George (1866-1946).	
ANN VERONICA, 1909. Introduction by <i>A. J. Hoppé</i> .	997
THE WHEELS OF CHANCE, 1896; and THE TIME MACHINE, 1895.	915
Wilde, Oscar.	
THE PICTURE OF DORIAN GRAY, 1891.	(See Poetry and Drama.)
Woolf, Virginia (1882-1941).	
TO THE LIGHTHOUSE, 1927. Introduction by <i>D. M. Hoare, PH.D.</i>	949
Zola, Émile (1840-1902).	
GERMINAL, 1885. Translated, with an Introduction, by <i>Havelock Ellis</i> .	897

HISTORY

Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. Translated and Edited by <i>G. N. Garmonsway, F.R.HIST.SOC.</i>	
Foreword by <i>Prof. Bruce Dickins</i> .	624
Bede, the Venerable (673-735).	
THE ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH NATION. Translated by <i>John Stevens</i> , revised by <i>J. A. Giles</i> , with notes by <i>L. C. Jane</i> . Introduction by <i>Prof. David Knowles, O.S.B., M.A., LITT.D., F.B.A., F.S.A.</i>	479
Carlyle, Thomas (1795-1881).	
THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1837. Introduction by <i>Hilaire Belloc</i> . 2 vols.	31-2
(See also Biography, Essays.)	
Chesterton, Cecil (1879-1918). A HISTORY OF THE U.S.A., 1917. Edited by <i>Prof. D. W. Brogan, M.A.</i>	965
Creasy, Sir Edward (1812-78).	
FIFTEEN DECISIVE BATTLES OF THE WORLD, FROM MARATHON TO WATERLOO, 1852.	
With Diagrams and Index. New Introduction by <i>Audrey Butler, M.A. (OXON.)</i>	300
Gibbon, Edward (1737-94).	
THE DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE, 1776-88. Notes by <i>Oliphant Smeaton</i> . Intro. by <i>Christopher Dawson</i> . Complete text in 6 vols.	434-6, 474-6
Green, John Richard (1837-83).	
A SHORT HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH PEOPLE, 1874. Introduction by <i>L. C. Jane</i> .	
English history from 607 to 1873. Continued by: 'A Political and Social Survey from 1815 to 1915,' by <i>R. P. Farley</i> , and revised to 1950.	727-8
Holinshed, Raphael (d. 1580?).	
HOLINSHED'S CHRONICLE AS USED IN SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS, 1578. Introduction by <i>Prof. Allardyce Nicoll and Josephine Nicoll</i> .	800
Joinville, Jean de. See Villehardouin.	
Lütow, Count Franz von (1849-1916).	
BOHEMIA: AN HISTORICAL SKETCH, 1896. Introduction by <i>President T. G. Masaryk</i> .	
H. A. Piehler covers events from 1879 to 1938.	432
Macaulay, Thomas Babington, Baron (1800-59).	
THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND. The complete text in four volumes, which together contain 2,450 pages. Introduction by <i>Douglas Jerrold</i> .	34-7
(See also Essays.)	
Maine, Sir Henry (1822-88).	
ANCIENT LAW, 1861. Introduction by <i>Prof. J. H. Morgan</i> .	734
Mommsen, Theodor (1817-1903).	
HISTORY OF ROME, 1856. Translated by <i>W. P. Dickson, LL.D.</i> Introduction by <i>Edward A. Freeman</i> . 4 vols. (Vols. III and IV only.)	544-5
Motley, John (1814-77).	
THE RISE OF THE DUTCH REPUBLIC, 1856. Intro. by <i>V. R. Reynolds</i> . 3 vols.	86-8
Paston Letters, The , 1418-1506. 2 vols. A selection.	752-3
Prescott, William Hickling (1796-1859).	
HISTORY OF THE CONQUEST OF MEXICO, 1843. 2 vols.	397-8
Stanley, Arthur (1815-81).	
LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF THE EASTERN CHURCH, 1861. Introduction by <i>A. J. Grieve, M.A.</i>	251
Thierry, Augustin (1795-1856).	
THE NORMAN CONQUEST, 1825. Introduction by <i>J. A. Price, B.A.</i> 2 vols. (Vol. I temporarily out of print.)	193-9
Villehardouin, Geoffrey de (1160?-1213?), and Joinville, Jean, Sire de (1224-1317).	
MEMOIRS OF THE CRUSADES. Translated, with an Introduction, by <i>Sir Frank T. Marzials</i> .	333
Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de (1694-1778).	
THE AGE OF LOUIS XIV, 1751. Translation by <i>Martyn P. Pollack</i> .	
(See also Fiction.)	780

- selections from four of the most famous of Sir Winston Churchill's World War speeches. 714
- EDMUND (1729-97). 714
- THES AND LETTERS ON AMERICAN AFFAIRS. New Introduction by the *Very Rev. Peter McKevitt*, PH.D. (See also Essays and Belles-Lettres.) 340
- ENES (384-322 B.C.).
- CROWN, AND OTHER ORATIONS. Translated with an Appendix on Athenian oracles by *C. Rann Kennedy*. Introduction by *John Warrington*. 546
- Abraham (1809-65).
- THES AND LETTERS, 1832-65. A new selection edited with an Introduction by *M. Angle*. Chronology of Lincoln's life and index. 206

POETRY AND DRAMA

- axon Poetry. English poetry between A.D. 650 and 1000, from 'Widsith' and 'vulf' to the battle-pieces of 'Brunanburh' and 'Maldon.' Selected and translated by *Prof. R. K. Gordon*, M.A. Reset, and revised by the translator, 1954. 794
- Matthew (1822-88).
- LETE POEMS. Introduction by *R. A. Scott-James*. 334
- A Book of British. Introduction and Notes by *R. Brimley Johnson*. Ballads the earliest times to those of Yeats and Kipling. 572
- it, Francis (1584-1616), and Fletcher, John (1579-1625).
- PLAYS. Introduction by *Prof. G. P. Baker*. 'The Knight of the Burning Wheel,' 'The Maid's Tragedy,' 'A King and No King,' 'The Faithful Shepherdess,' 'Wild Goose Chase,' 'Bonduca,' with a glossary. 506
- William (1757-1827).
- S AND PROPHECIES. Edited, with special Introduction, by *Max Plowman*. 792
- Emily.
- s. (See Fiction.)
- Robert (1812-89).
- S AND PLAYS, 1833-64. With a new Introduction by *John Bryson*, M.A., dealing the four-volume Everyman Browning set. 2 vols. Volume III, containing *The and the Book*, Browning's long dramatic poem (No. 502), is temporarily out of 41-2
- s, 1871-90. Introduction by *M. M. Bozman*. 964
- Robert (1759-96).
- S AND SONGS. A very full selection and a very accurate text of Burns's copious output. Edited and introduced by *Prof. James Kinsley*, M.A., PH.D. 94
- (See also Biography.)
- George Gordon Noel, Lord (1788-1824).
- POETICAL AND DRAMATIC WORKS. 3 vols. Edited with a Preface by *Guy Pocock* (See also Biography.) 486-8
- A CENTURY OF HUMOROUS VERSE, 1850-1950. Edited by *Roger Lancelyn* 813
- , M.A., B.LITT.
- Geoffrey (c. 1343-1400).
- ERBURY TALES. New standard text edited by *A. C. Cawley*, M.A., PH.D., based on Ellesmere Manuscript, with an ingenious system of glosses, page by page. 307
- US AND CRISEYDE. Prepared by *John Warrington* from the Campsall Manuscript. 992
- , Samuel Taylor (1772-1834).
- GOLDEN BOOK. (See also Essays, etc.) 43
- William (1731-1800).
- s. Intro. by *Hugh I'Anson Fausset*. (See also Biography.) 872
- ighieri (1265-1321).
- DIVINE COMEDY, first printed 1472. H. F. Cary's Translation, 1805-14. Edited, with Notes and Index, by *Edmund Gardner*. Foreword by *Prof. Mario Praz*. 308
- re, Walter (1873-1956). (See Essays.)
- ohn (1573-1631).
- LETE POEMS. Edited, with a revised Intro., by *Hugh I'Anson Fausset*. 867
- John (1631-1700).
- s. Edited by *Bonamy Dobrée*, O.B.E., M.A. 910
- th-century Plays. Edited by *John Hampden*. Includes Gay's 'Beggar's Opera,' Swift's 'Cato,' Rowe's 'Jane Shore,' Fielding's 'Tragedy of Tragedies, or, Tom Thumb the Great,' Lillo's 'George Barnwell,' Colman and Garrick's 'Clandestine Marriage,' and Cumberland's 'West Indian.' 818
- Galaxy of Shorter Poems. The. Chosen and Edited by *Gerald Bullett*. 959
- Religious Verse. Edited by *G. Lacey May*. An anthology from the Middle Ages to the present day, including some 300 poems by 150 authors. 937
- n, and Medieval Miracle Plays. New edition edited by *A. C. Cawley*, M.A., with Forewords to individual plays. 381
- Ed, Edward (1809-83). See 'Persian Poems.'

- FAUST.** Both parts of the tragedy which are the core of Goethe's life-work, in the re-edited translation of *Sir Theodore Martin*. (See also Biography, Essays.) 335
- Golden Book of Modern English Poetry, The.** Edited by *Thomas Caldwell* and *Philip Henderson*, containing some 300 poems by 130 poets, from T. E. Brown to Stephen Spender and O. Day Lewis. 921
- Golden Treasury of English Songs and Lyrics, The,** 1861. Compiled by Francis Turner Palgrave (1824-97). Enlarged edition, containing 88-page supplement. 96
- Golden Treasury of Longer Poems, The.** Revised edition (1954) with new supplementary poems. An anthology ranging from Chaucer to Walter de la Mare. 746
- Goldsmith, Oliver** (1728-74). 415
- POEMS AND PLAYS.** Edited, with Introduction, by *Austin Dobson*. (See also Fiction.)
- Gray, Thomas** (1716-71). 628
- POEMS: WITH A SELECTION OF LETTERS AND ESSAYS.** Introduction by *John Drinkwater*, and biographical notes by *Lewis Gibbs*. 628
- Heine, Heinrich** (c. 1797-1856). 911
- PROSE AND POETRY.** With Matthew Arnold's essay on Heine. 911
- Ibsen, Henrik** (1828-1906). 185
- A DOLL'S HOUSE, 1879; THE WILD DUCK, 1884; and THE LADY FROM THE SEA, 1888.** Translated by *R. Farquharson Sharp* and *Elanor Marx-Aveling*. 494
- GHOSTS, 1881; THE WARRIORS AT HELGELAND, 1857; and AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE, 1882.** Translated by *R. Farquharson Sharp*. 552
- PEER GYNT, 1867.** Translated by *R. Farquharson Sharp*. 747
- THE PRETENDERS, 1864; PILARS OF SOCIETY, 1877; and ROSMERSHOLM, 1887.** Translated by *R. Farquharson Sharp*. 659
- Ingoldsby Legends, or Mirth and Marvels,** by 'Thomas Ingoldsby, Esq.' Edited by *D. C. Browning, M.A., B.LITT.* 185
- International Modern Plays.** August Strindberg's 'Lady Julie,' Gerhard Hauptmann's 'Hannele,' Brothers Cipek's 'The Life of the Insects,' Jean Cocteau's 'The Infernal Machine,' and Luigi Chiarelli's 'The Mask and the Face.' Introduction by *Anthony Dent*. 989
- Jonson, Ben** (1573-1637). 489-90
- PLAYS.** Introduction by *Prof. F. E. Schelling*. 2 vols. Complete collection. 489-90
- Keats, John** (1795-1821). 101
- POEMS.** Revised, reset edition (1944). Edited by *Gerald Bullett*. (See also Biography.)
- Kingsley, Charles** (1819-75). 793
- POEMS.** With Introduction by *Ernest Rhys*. (See also Fiction.) 793
- La Fontaine, Jean de** (1621-95). 991
- FABLES, 1668.** Presented complete in the renowned Sir Edward Marsh translation. 991
- Langland, William** (1330?-1400?). 571
- PIERS PLOWMAN, 1362.** Translation into modern English by *Donald* and *Rachel Altheater*. 571
- Lawrence, David Herbert** (1885-1930). (See Essays.)
- Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim** (1729-81). 843
- LAOCOÖN, 1786, AND OTHER WRITINGS.** Introduction by *W. A. Steel*. Contents: 'Laocoön'; 'Minna von Barnhelm,' 1767, a comedy in five acts; and 'Nathan the Wise,' 1779, his philosophical drama. 843
- Longfellow, Henry Wadsworth** (1807-82). 382
- POEMS, 1823-66.** 382
- Marlowe, Christopher** (1564-93). 383
- PLAYS AND POEMS.** New edition with an Introduction by *M. R. Ridley, M.A.* 383
- Milton, John** (1608-74). 384
- POEMS.** New edition by *Prof. B. A. Wright, M.A.*, based on Milton's editions and manuscripts. With a new Introduction by *Prof. Wright*. (See also Essays.) 384
- Minor Elizabethan Drama, 2 vols.** Vol. I. Tragedy. Norton and Sackville's 'Gorboduc,' Kyd's 'Spanish Tragedy,' Peele's 'David and Bethsabe,' and 'Arden of Feversham,' Vol. II. Comedy. Udall's 'Ralph Roister Doister,' Lyly's 'Endimion,' Peele's 'Old Wives' Tale,' Greene's 'Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay,' etc. Introduction by *Prof. A. Thorndike*. Glossary. 491-2
- Minor Poets of the Seventeenth Century.** The Poems of Thomas Carew, Sir John Suckling, Lord Herbert, Richard Lovelace. Edited and revised by *R. G. Howarth, B.A., B.LITT., F.R.S.L.* 873
- Modern Plays.** R. C. Sherriff's 'Journey's End,' W. Somerset Maugham's 'For Services Rendered,' Noel Coward's 'Hay Fever,' A. A. Milne's 'The Dover Road,' Arnold Bennett and Edward Knoblock's 'Milestones.' Introduction by *John Hadfield*. 942.
- Molière, Jean Baptiste de** (1622-73). 830-1
- COMEDIES.** Introduction by *Prof. F. C. Green*. 2 vols. 830-1
- New Golden Treasury, The.** Introduction by *Ernest Rhys*. A companion to Palgrave (q.v.), giving earlier lyrics than he did, and also later. 695
- Omar Khayyám** (d. 1123?). (See under Persian Poems.)

- Lyrics, The.' 96
- Iran Poems. Selected and edited by *Prof. A. J. Arberry, M.A., Litt.D., F.B.A.* 996
- Edgar Allan (1809-49). 996
- POEMS AND ESSAYS. Introduction by *Andrew Lang*. (See also Fiction.) 791
- ms of our Time. An Anthology edited by *Richard Church, C.B.E., M. M. Bosman* and *Edith Sitwell, D.Litt., D.B.E.* Nearly 400 poems by about 130 poets. 981
- a, Alexander (1688-1744). 981
- COLLECTED POEMS. Edited with Intro. (1956) by *Prof. Bonamy Dobrée, O.B.E., M.A.* 780
- oration Plays. Introduction by *Edmund Gosse*. Includes Dryden's 'All for Love,' Wycherley's 'The Country Wife,' Congreve's 'The Way of the World,' Otway's 'Venice Preserved,' Farquhar's 'Beaux-Stratagem,' Vanbrugh's 'Provoked Wife' and Etherege's 'Man of Mode.' 604
- etti, Dante Gabriel (1828-82). 604
- POEMS AND TRANSLATIONS. Introduction by *E. G. Gardner*. 627
- respeare, William (1564-1616). 627
- A Complete Edition, based on Clark and Wright's Cambridge text, and edited by *Alphart Smeaton*. With biographical Introduction, Chronological Tables and full Glossary. 3 vols. 627
- Comedies, 153; Histories, Poems and Sonnets, 154; Tragedies, 155
- ey, Percy Bysshe (1792-1822). 257-8
- POETICAL WORKS. Introduction by *A. H. Koszul*. 2 vols. 257-8
- idan, Richard Brinsley (1751-1816). 95
- COMPLETE PLAYS. Introduction and notes by *Lewis Gibbs*. 95
- r Poets of the Sixteenth Century. Edited by *Gerald Bullett*. The works of Sir Thomas Wyatt (1503-42), Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey (1517-47), Sir Philip Sidney (1554-86), Sir Walter Raleigh (1552-1618) and Sir John Davies (1569-1626). 985
- ser, Edmund (1552-99). 985
- HE FAIRIE QUEENE. Introduction by *Prof. J. W. Hales*, and Glossary. 2 vols. 443-4
- The reliable Morris text and glossary are used for this edition. 443-4
- HE SHEPHERD'S CALENDAR, 1579; and OTHER POEMS. Introduction by *Philip Henderson*. 879
- nson, Robert Louis (1850-94). 879
- POEMS. A CHILD'S GARDEN OF VERSES, 1885; UNDERWOODS, 1887; SONGS OF RAVEL, 1896; and BALLADS, 1890, Introduction by *Ernest Rhys*. 768
- (See also Essays, Fiction, Travel.) 768
- burne, Algernon Charles (1837-1909). 961
- POEMS AND PROSE. A selection, edited with an Intro. by *Richard Church*. 961
- a, J. M. (1871-1909). 968
- LAYS, POEMS AND PROSE. Introduction by *Michael Mac Liammóir*. 968
- khov, Anton (1860-1904). 941
- LAYS AND STORIES. 'The Cherry Orchard,' 'The Seagull,' 'The Wood Demon,' 'Fatyana Riepin' and 'On the Harmfulness of Tobacco' are included, as well as 3 of his best stories. The translation is by *S. S. Kotliansky*. Introduction by *David Magarshack*. 941
- yson, Alfred, Lord (1809-92). 44, 626
- POEMS. A comprehensive edition (1950), with an Introduction by *Mildred Bozman*. 44, 626
- ty-four One-Act Plays. Enlarged edition, new Introduction by *John Hampden*. Contains plays by T. S. Eliot, Sean O'Casey, Laurence Housman, W. B. Yeats, James Bridie, Noel Coward, Lord Dunsany, Wolf Mankowitz and others. 947
- ter, John (1580?-1625?), and Ford, John (1586-1639). 947
- SELECTED PLAYS. Introduction by *Prof. G. B. Harrison, M.A., Ph.D.* In one volume: 'The White Devil,' 'The Duchess of Malfi,' 'The Broken Heart,' 'Tis Pity She's a 'hore.' 899
- man, Walt (1819-92). 899
- RAVES OF GRASS, 1855-92. New edition (1947) by *Dr Emory Holloway*. 573
- o, Oscar (1854-1900). 573
- LAYS, PROSE WRITINGS, AND POEMS. Edited, with Introduction, by *Hesketh Carson*. Including the two plays, 'The Importance of Being Earnest' and 'Lady Indermere's Fan'; his novel, 'The Picture of Dorian Gray'; the poem, 'The Ballad of Reading Gaol'; the essay, 'The Soul of Man,' etc. 858
- sworth, William (1770-1850). 858
- POEMS. Edited, with Introductory study, notes, bibliography and full Index, by *Philip Wayne, M.A.* 203, 311, 998

REFERENCE

er's Guide to Everyman's Library. Compiled by *A. J. Hoppé*. This volume is a new compilation and gives in one alphabetical sequence the names of all the authors, titles and subjects in Everyman's Library and its supplementary series, Everyman's Reference Library and the Children's Illustrated Classics. 889

ny volumes formerly included in Everyman's Library reference section are now included in Everyman's Reference Library and are bound in larger format. 889

- by *Eugene Mason*. 497
- Boccaccio, Giovanni** (1313-75).
DECAMERON, 1471. Translated by *J. M. Rigg*, 1903. Introduction by *Edward Hutton*, 2 vols. Unabridged. 845-6
- Bunyan, John** (1628-88).
PILGRIM'S PROGRESS, Parts I and II, 1678-84. Reset edition. Introduction by *Prof. G. B. Harrison*, M.A., PH.D. (See also Theology and Philosophy.) 204
- Jervantes, Saavedra Miguel de** (1547-1616).
DON QUIXOTE DE LA MANCHA. Translated by *P. A. Motteux*. Notes by *J. G. Lockhart*. Introduction and supplementary Notes by *L. B. Wallon*, M.A., B.LITT. 2 vols. 385-6
- Chrétien de Troyes** (fl. 12th cent.).
ARTHURIAN ROMANCES ('Erce et Enide'; 'Cligés'; 'Yvain' and 'Lancelot'). Translated into prose, with Introduction, notes and bibliography, by *William Wistar Comfort*. 698
- Calevala, or The Land of Heroes**. Translated from the Finnish by *W. F. Kirby*. 2 vols. 259-60
- Maibinogion, The**. Translated with Introduction by *Thomas Jones*, M.A., D.LITT., and *Gwyn Jones*, M.A. 97
- Malory, Sir Thomas** (fl. 1400?-70).
LE MORTE D'ARTHUR. Introduction by *Sir John Rhys*. 2 vols. 45-6
- Marie de France** (12th century), **LAYS OF, AND OTHER FRENCH LEGENDS**. Eight of Marie's 'Lais' and two of the anonymous French love stories of the same period translated with an Introduction by *Eugene Mason*. 557
- Njal's Saga. THE STORY OF BURNT NJAL** (written about 1280-90). Translated from the Icelandic by *Sir G. W. Dasent* (1861). Introduction (1957) and Index by *Prof. Edward Turville-Petre*, B.LITT., M.A. 558
- Rabelais, François** (1494?-1553).
THE HEROIC DEEDS OF GARGANTUA AND PANTAGRUEL, 1532-5. Introduction by *D. B. Wyndham Lewis*. 2 vols. A complete unabridged edition of Urquhart and Motteux's translation, 1653-94. 826-7

SCIENCE

- Boyle, Robert** (1627-91).
THE SCRIPTURAL CHYMIST, 1661. Introduction by *M. M. Pattison Muir*. 559
- Darwin, Charles** (1809-82).
THE ORIGIN OF SPECIES, 1859. The sixth edition embodies Darwin's final additions and revisions. New Introduction (1956) by *W. R. Thompson*, F.R.S. (See also Travel and Topography.) 811
- Hddington, Arthur Stanley** (1882-1944).
THE NATURE OF THE PHYSICAL WORLD, 1928. Introduction by *Sir Edmund Whittaker*, F.R.S., O.M. 922
- Euclid** (fl. c. 330-c. 275 B.C.).
THE ELEMENTS OF EUCLID. Edited by *Isaac Todhunter*, with Introduction by *Sir Thomas L. Heath*, R.C.B., F.R.S. 891
- Faraday, Michael** (1791-1867).
EXPERIMENTAL RESEARCHES IN ELECTRICITY, 1839-55. With Plates and Diagrams, and an appreciation by *Prof. John Tyndall*. 576
- Farvey, William** (1578-1657).
THE CIRCULATION OF THE BLOOD. Introduction by *Ernest Parkyn*. 262
- Howard, John** (1726?-90).
THE STATE OF THE PRISONS, 1777. Intro. and Notes by *Kenneth Ruck*. 835
- Jarx, Karl** (1818-83).
CAPITAL, 1867. Translated by *Eden and Cedar Paul*. 2 vols. Introduction by *Prof. G. D. H. Cole*. 848-9
- Mill, John Stuart** (1806-73). See *Wollstonecraft*.
- Mwen, Robert** (1771-1858).
A NEW VIEW OF SOCIETY, 1813; and **OTHER WRITINGS**. Introduction by *G. D. H. Cole*. 799
- earson, Karl** (1857-1936).
THE GRAMMAR OF SCIENCE, 1892. 939
- icardo, David** (1772-1823).
THE PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY AND TAXATION, 1817. Introduction by *Prof. Michael P. Fogarty*, M.A. 590
- mith, Adam** (1723-90).
THE WEALTH OF NATIONS, 1766. Intro. by *Prof. Edwin Seligman*. 2 vols. 412-13
- White, Gilbert** (1720-93).
A NATURAL HISTORY OF SELBORNE, 1789. New edition (1949). Introduction and Notes by *R. M. Lockley*. 48
- Wollstonecraft, Mary** (1759-97), **THE RIGHTS OF WOMAN**, 1792; and **Mill, John Stuart** (1806-73), **THE SUBJECTION OF WOMEN**, 1869. New Introduction by *Pamela Frankau*. 825

- ent Hebrew Literature. Being the Old Testament and Apocrypha, arranged by
Dr. Bruce Taylor. 4 vols. *Volumes I and IV only in print.* 253, 256
 on, Francis (1561-1620).
- THE ADVANCEMENT OF LEARNING, 1605. Introduction, Notes, Index and Glossary.
by G. W. Kitchin. (See also Essays.) 719
- aley, George (1685-1753).
- NEW THEORY OF VISION, 1709. Introduction by *A. D. Lindsay*, C.B.E., LL.D. 483
- ne, Sir Thomas (1605-82).
- RELIGIO MEDICI, 1642. New Introduction by *Halliday Sutherland*, M.D., F.R.S.L. 92
- yan, John (1628-88).
- RACE ABOUNDING, 1666; and THE LIFE AND DEATH OF MR BADMAN, 1658. Intro-
 duction by *Prof. G. B. Harrison*, M.A., PH.D. (See also Romance.) 815
- ese Philosophy in Classical Times. Covering the period 1500 B.C.-A.D. 100. Edited
 and translated, with Introduction and Notes. 973
- artes, René (1596-1650).
- DISCOURSE ON METHOD, 1637; MEDITATIONS ON THE FIRST PHILOSOPHY, 1641;
 and PRINCIPLES OF PHILOSOPHY, 1644. Translated by *Prof. J. Veitch*. Introduction
by A. D. Lindsay, C.B.E., LL.D. 570
- Havelock (1859-1939).
- ELECTED ESSAYS. Sixteen essays, with an Introduction by *J. S. Collis*. 930
- Charles (1853-1932).
- HE PHILOSOPHY OF THE GOOD LIFE, 1930. 924
- u Scriptures. Edited by *Nicol Macnicol*, M.A., D.LITT., D.D. Foreword by *Rabin-*
anath Tagore. 944
- es, Thomas (1588-1679).
- EVIATHAN, 1651. Introduction by *A. D. Lindsay*, C.B.E., LL.D. 691
- er, Richard (1554-1600).
- THE LAWS OF ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY, 1597. Introduction by *G. C. Morris*, M.A. 201-2
- s, David (1711-76).
- TREATISE OF HUMAN NATURE, 1739. Intro. by *A. D. Lindsay*, C.B.E., LL.D. 2 vols. 548-9
- s, William (1842-1910).
- APERS ON PHILOSOPHY. Introduction by *Prof. C. M. Bakewell.* 739
- Immanuel (1724-1804).
- ITIQUE OF PURE REASON, 1781. With an Introduction by *A. D. Lindsay*, C.B.E.,
 LL.D. Translated by *J. M. D. Meiklejohn.* 909
- Edward VI (1537-53).
- IE FIRST (1549) AND SECOND (1552) PRAYER BOOKS. Introduction by *Bishop*
son. 448
- l, The. Rodwell's Translation, 1861. Intro. by *Rev. G. Margoliouth*, M.A. 380
- William (1686-1761).
- SERIOUS CALL TO A DEVOUT AND HOLY LIFE, 1728. Introduction by *Prof. Norman*
kes, F.B.A., M.A., D.PHIL. 91
- z, Gottfried Wilhelm (1646-1716).
- LOSOPHICAL WRITINGS. Selected and translated by *Mary Morris*, with an
 introduction by *C. R. Morris*, M.A. 905
- , John (1632-1704).
- VO TREATISES OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT, 1690. Introduction by *Prof. W. S. Car-*
ter. (See also Essays.) 751
- as, Thomas Robert (1766-1834).
- ESSAY ON THE PRINCIPLE OF POPULATION, 1798. New Introduction by *Prof.*
Michael P. Fogarty, M.A. 2 vols. 692-3
- ohn Stuart (1806-73).
- UTARIANISM, 1863; LIBERTY, 1859; and REPRESENTATIVE GOVERNMENT,
 1911. Introduction by *A. D. Lindsay*, C.B.E., LL.D. (See also Science.) 482
- Sir Thomas (1478-1535).
- OPIA, 1516; and DIALOGUE OF COMFORT AGAINST TRIBULATION, 1553. Intro-
 duction by *John Warrington*. Revised edition (1951). 461
- estament, The. 93
- an, John Henry, Cardinal (1801-90).
- DLOGIA PRO VITA SUA, 1864. Introduction by *Sir John Shane Leslie.* 636
 (See also Essays.)
- he, Friedrich Wilhelm (1844-1900).
- US SPAKE ZARATHUSTRA, 1883-91. Translated by *Prof. A. Tille* and revised by
M. Bozman. Introduction (1957) by *Prof. Roy Pascal*, M.A., D.LITT. 892
- Thomas (1737-1809).
- HITS OF MAN, 1792. Introduction by *Arthur Seldon.* 718
- Blaise (1623-82).
- SSÉES, 1670. Translated by *John Warrington*. Introduction by *Louis Lafuma.*
 s translation is from Lafuma's second edition. 874
- ana and Mahabharata. Condensed into English verse by *Romesh Dutt*, C.I.E. 403

- Busséau, Jean Jacques** (1712-78).
THE SOCIAL CONTRACT, 1762; and **OTHER ESSAYS**. Introduction by *G. D. H. Cole*.
 (See also Biography, Essays.) 660
- Ant Augustine** (353-430).
CONFESSIONS. Dr Pusey's Translation, 1838, with Introduction by *A. H. Armstrong*, M.A. 200
THE CITY OF GOD. Complete text of John Healey's Elizabethan Translation, 1610.
 Edited by *R. V. G. Tasker*, M.A., B.D., with an Introduction by *Sir Ernest Barker*.
 2 vols. 982-3
- Ant Francis** (1182-1226).
THE LITTLE FLOWERS; THE MIRROR OF PERFECTION (by Leo of Assisi); and **THE LIFE OF ST FRANCIS** (by St Bonaventura). Introduction by *Thomas Okey*. 485
- inoza, Benedictus de** (1632-77).
ETHICS, 1677; and **ON THE CORRECTION OF THE UNDERSTANDING**, 1687. Translated by *Andrew Boyle*. New Introduction by *T. S. Gregory*. 481
- edenborg, Emanuel** (1688-1772).
THE TRUE CHRISTIAN RELIGION, 1771. New and unabridged translation by *F. Bayley*. Introduction by *Dr Helen Keller*. 960 pages. 893
- omas & Kempis** (1380?-1471).
THE IMITATION OF CHRIST, 1471. 484
- omas Aquinas** (1225-74).
SELECTED WRITINGS. Selected and edited by *Father M. C. D'Arcy*. 953

TRAVEL AND TOPOGRAPHY

- orrow, George** (1803-81).
THE BIBLE IN SPAIN, 1842. Introduction by *Edward Thomas*. 151
WILD WALES: the People, Language and Scenery, 1862. Introduction by *David Jones*, C.B.E., the painter and Borrowian. (See also Fiction.) 49
- oswell, James** (1740-95).
JOURNAL OF A TOUR TO THE HEBRIDES WITH SAMUEL JOHNSON, 1786. Edited, with a new Introduction, by *Lawrence F. Powell*, M.A., HON. D.LITT. 387
- alderón de la Barca, Mme** (1804-82).
LIFE IN MEXICO, 1843. Introduction by *Manuel Romero De Terreros*. 664
- obbett, William** (1762-1835).
RURAL RIDES, 1830. Introduction by *Asa Briggs*, M.A., B.SO. 2 vols. 638-9
- ook, James** (1728-79).
VOYAGES OF DISCOVERY. Edited by *John Barrow*, F.R.S., F.S.A. Introduction by *Guy Pocock*, M.A. 99
- réveccœur, J. Hector St John de** (1735-1813).
LETTERS FROM AN AMERICAN FARMER, 1782. Intro. and Notes by *W. Barton Blake*. 640
- arwin, Charles** (1809-82).
THE VOYAGE OF THE 'BEAGLE', 1839. (See also Science.) 104
- efoe, Daniel** (1661?-1731).
A TOUR THROUGH ENGLAND AND WALES, 1724-6. Intro. by *G. D. H. Cole*. 2 vols. (See also Fiction.) 820-1
- Kinglake, Alexander** (1809-91).
EOTHEN, 1844. Introduction by *Harold Spender*. 337
- ane, Edward William** (1801-76).
MANNERS AND CUSTOMS OF THE MODERN EGYPTIANS, 1836. With a new Introduction by *Moursi Saad el-Din*, of the Egyptian Ministry of Education. 315
- ark, Mungo** (1771-1806).
TRAVELS. Introduction (1954) by *Prof. Ronald Miller*, M.A., PH.D. 205
- olo, Marco** (1254-1324).
TRAVELS. Introduction by *John Masefield*. 306
- ortuguese Voyages**, 1498-1663. Edited by *Charles David Ley*. 986
- tevenson, Robert Louis** (1850-94).
AN INLAND VOYAGE, 1878; **TRAVELS WITH A DONKEY**, 1879; and **THE SILVERADO SQUATTERS**, 1883. New Introduction by *M. R. Ridley*, M.A. 766
 (See also Essays, Poetry, Fiction.)
- stow, John** (1525?-1605).
THE SURVEY OF LONDON. The fullest account of Elizabethan London. 589
- Wakefield, Edward Gibbon** (1796-1862).
A LETTER FROM SYDNEY, AND OTHER WRITINGS ON COLONIZATION. Introduction by *Prof. R. C. Mills*. 828
- Waterton, Charles** (1782-1865).
WANDERINGS IN SOUTH AMERICA, 1825. Introduction by *Edmund Selous*. 772



bon, whose *Decline and Fall* profoundly influenced Green.

In a hundred and more fine pieces of description Green's literary style is evident. Read his description of the Death of Elizabeth I. 'Her own England, the England which had grown up around her, serious, moral, prosaic, shrank coldly from this child of earth and the Renaissance, brilliant, fanciful, unscrupulous, irreligious. She had enjoyed life as the men of her day enjoyed it, and now that they were gone she clung to it with a fierce tenacity. She hunted, she danced, she jested with her young favourites, she coquetted and scolded and frolicked at sixty-seven as she had done at thirty. . . . Gradually her mind gave way. She lost her memory, the violence of her temper became unbearable, her very courage seemed to forsake her. She called for a sword to lie constantly beside her, and thrust it from time to time through the arras, as if she heard murderers stirring there. . . . She sat day and night propped up with pillows on a stool, her finger on her lip, her eyes fixed on the floor, without a word. . . . She was in fact fast becoming insensible; and early the next morning the life of Elizabeth, a life so great, so strange and lonely in its greatness, passed quietly away.'